DOLRT DEIS - NO BUILD - 672 Citizen online petition

NC54 Transit Impact [nc54.transit.impact@gmail.com]

Sent: 10/13/2015 10:14 AM

To: info@ourtransitfuture.com

Submitted for the record, the following 672 citizens signed this online petition against the current proposed DOLRT plan (http://bit.ly/noDOLRT)

https://www.gopetition.com/petitions/stop-durham-orange-light-rail-train.html

Stop Durham-Orange Light Rail Train

Petition published by Smart Transit Future on Jun 05, 2015 672 Signatures

Target: City, County, State and Federal officials, DCHC MPO and GoTriangle

Region: United States of America

Petition Background (Preamble):

With the final recommendations being unveiled by GoTriangle, many in the community are now actively seeking to stop this project.

Upon deeper investigation, many of the GoTriangle planning assumptions are either highly questionable or so erroneous that making an informed decision on the options is impossible.

We urge local, county, state and Federal decision-makers to require an independent review by external parties that have no role in the development of the PLAN and do not stand to benefit from decisions regarding the PLAN.

Petition:

We, the undersigned, call on you to **REJECT** the current proposed Durham-Orange Light Rail project and pursue more cost effective alternatives that will meet the long term needs of the region.

Attachments: AND BUILD PETITION.xisx

Copyright © 2003-2015. All rights reserved.

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-------------|-------------|-------|---------|-------------|-----------|--------|----------|------------|---|
| N/G | CLARE | ABRAHAMSON | | | CHAPEL HILL | NC | N/G | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | I REJECT THE CURRENT PROPOSED DURHAM |
| | | | | | | | | | | ORANGE LIGHT RAIL PROJECT AND AM PURSUING |
| | | | | | | | | | | MORE COST EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVES THAT WILL |
| | | | | | | | | | | MEET THE LONG TERM NEEDS OF THE REGION. |
| | | | | | | _ | | | | |
| Ms | Marilyn | Agney | _ | С | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27515 | 10-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Dona | Aguayo | _ | - | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 24-Jul-15 | No Depot on Farrington Rd. |
| N/G | Barbara | Ailsworth | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs | Kimberly | Aitken | | ì | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 23-Jun-15 | I do not want this noisy place so close to my nice |
| | | | | | | | | | | housing community and am worried it will lower my |
| | | | | | | | | | | house value. Please find a non-residential location. |
| N/G | Benjamin | Aitken | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 1-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mrs | Kimberly | Aitken | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 26-Jul-15 | This area is all residential with nice communities of |
| | , | | | | ' | | | | | school children, retirees, and hard working people |
| | | | | | | | | | | who have worked their lives to be able to live in |
| | | | | | | | | | | these homes. An industrial facility like this has no |
| | | | | | | | | | | place in this area and should find a more business |
| | | | | | | | | | | oriented industrial location. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mrs. | Alyssa | Alegre | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Louis | Almekinders | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 11-Oct-15 | N/G |
| ms | jennifer | anderson | | | chapel hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Thomas | Anderson | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27514 | 14-Sep-15 | Terrible waste of my tax dollars. Please don't build |
| | | | | | | | | | | this expensive piece of junk. |
| Ms | Elizabeth | Andrews | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Dave | Anna | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27515 | 1-Oct-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Mark | Anna | | | Chapel hill | Durham | USA | 27517 | 1-Oct-15 | Commuter populations don't travel these routes as |
| | | | | | | | | | | is. The general population doesn't travel to either |
| | | | | | | | | | | downtown chapel hill or Durham on a regular basis. |
| | | | | | | | | | | A major waste of money that couldn't be diverted |
| | | | | | | | | | | towards usable infrastructure. |
| Mr. | Michael | Anna | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27514 | 1-Oct-15 | I am strongly opposed to the current plan for this |
| | | | | | | | | | | light rail system. |
| N/G | Kathrynne | Anna | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 1-Oct-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Nancie | Archin | 7 | _ | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 4-Sep-15 | N/G |
| N/G | N. J. | B. | 7 | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517-94 | 2 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Bok | Baek | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 24-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Ann | Bailey | | | chapel hill | nc | N/G | 27514 | 25-Jun-15 | The purpose of this very expensive project is |
| | | | | | | | | | | questionable, since much of the growth in the RTP |
| | | | | | | | | | | area is in Raleigh. There is not sufficient traffic |
| | | | | | | | | | | between durham and orange counties to warrant |
| | | | | | | | | | | this massive endeavor |
| Mrs | ross | baker | | • | chapel hill | North Car | o USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | If this route must happen, it should be built above |
| | | | | | | | | | | grade level. At ground level, people south of the |
| | | | | | | | | | | railway will be trapped in case of an emmergency |
| | | | | | | | | | | such as needing to get someone to the hospital. |
| | . " | 2.11 | | | 01 1177 | | 1(0 | 07547 | | 11/0 |
| N/G | Jeff | Baldino | - | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Christopher | Baldino | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------------|----------|-------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| N/G | Deborah | Barab | | | Durham, | NC | USA | 27705 | 30-Sep-15 | The financial numbers need to be re-crunched. The cost vs. need/use does not seem realistic or feasible. I think that the companies associated with the building of this project are pushing to hard and not using reasonable arguments for the need. It's like the apples to apples argument. You've got apples to squash. (not even fruit) As a Durham resident, I ask you to review the need vs cost. Would make more sense to connect Raleigh to Durham before Chapel Hill. (and I love Chapel Hill) |
| N/G | Natalie | Barbare | | | Durham | Durham | USA | 27705 | 8-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Marcia | Barfield | | | Chapel hill | Nc | USA | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr | William T. Toby | Barfield | | | Chapel hill | Nc | N/G | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Kaye | Barker | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27516 | 8-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Ted | Barrow | | | CHAPEL HILL | North Card | | 27517 | 7-Jul-15 | Cutting off proper vehicle access to and from the areas south of the light rail grade level crossings will only create congestion, especially during rush hour for communities such as Chapelwood and Downing Creek. Meadowmont was designed to allow for this access and has a very small vehicle load as compared to the area affected by C2/C2A. |
| N/G | Alice | Barrow | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | USA | 27517 | 7-Jul-15 | I do not agree with the light rail project crossing the intersection of Barbee Chapel Road nor the other 3 intersections near it. This will cause too much congestion and create safety issues for the many people who already commute using Barbee Chapel to access route 54. This would only be safe and sane if a bridge was built for the light rail to go over these intersections. In addition, the original plan of the rail going through Meadowmont should not now be changed to the detriment of those living south of 54. |
| N/G | Taren | Basnight | | ! | Durham | North Card | USA | 27707 | 27-Jul-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| N/G | Anthony | Batton | | | Chapel Hill | NC NC | USA | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | I feel the light rail as presented is a waste of money. It falls short on providing parking and weather protection for riders if it has riders. This area's culture is drive solo first. Many do this to have transportation available in case of emergency be it a child or whatever. That is why carpooling and buses as ideas have failed or are seldom used. It will cause unprecedented traffic delays for Barbee Chapel Road which gets worse with every passing day. If you proceed with this project, please hear my resounding "I told you so" every 10-15 minutes when those empty cars go round and round. |
| Mrs. | Betsy | Batton | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | It's a waste of money and time and will cause lots of traffic problems on Barbee Chapel Road |
| Mrs | Tanja | Bauer | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Daniel | Bauer | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs | Kimberly | Bauer | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 23-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Eugene | Bauer | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 23-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Ginger | Bauer | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 27-Jun-15 | I vigorously OPPOSE the proposed light rail system. |
| N/G | Steven | Bearden | | ļ. | Chapel hill | North Card | | 27517 | 26-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | bradford | becken | | _ | chapel hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 1-Oct-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Larry | Beckler | | | Durham | North Card | _ | 27713 | 10-Oct-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Joanne | Beckman | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27712 | 8-Oct-15 | Trains may be good for long distances at high speed, but not short distances with multiple stops. If public transportation is needed, buses or vans are preferable, because routes can be changed to accomodate technology, population changes. and economical needs of the community as it develops. Light rail is not cost-effective for the future. Use the money to enhance bus service and fix the roads. |
| N/G | David | Bell | | i | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 1-Jul-15 | I reject the current proposal, but I am in favor of a Durham-Orange Light Rail project. |
| Ms | Sharon | Bellmore | | | DURHAM | North Card | USA | 27707 | 1-Jul-15 | Please reject the current proposed track down through Farrington Rd. |
| N/G | Dane | Berglund | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | The Lite Rail train system will potentially ruin our residential retirement community |
| Dr | Marcus | Berzofsky | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Anne | Billings | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | I oppose the current DO Light Rail Project and strongly urge that all facets of the plan be re-evaluated by an independent organization. |
| N/G | Timothy | Billings | | _ | chapel hill | nc | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | stop this |
| N/G | David | Biswell | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|--------------|----------|--------------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|------------|---|
| Mrs | Sue | Biswell | | • | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 23-Jul-15 | Where are car parking sites going to be located for |
| | | | | | | | | | | those driving to a rider depot located? |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Not connecting to airport is a major flaw. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ms. | Lori | Black | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 10-Oct-15 | The project as it is currently conceived is |
| | | | | | | | | | | -based on fundamentally unsound ridership |
| | | | | | | | | | | projections and will not result in any appreciable |
| | | | | | | | | | | reduction in automobile congestion in the Chapel |
| | | | | | | | | | | Hill-Durham road corridor. |
| | | | | | | | | | | -the routing of the proposed light rail track is not |
| | | | | | | | | | | aligned with the higher density compact |
| | | | | | | | | | | neighborhood developments in Orange and |
| | | | | | | | | | | Chatham counties. |
| | | | | | | | | | | -there is no incentive to take light rail to reduce |
| | | | | | | | | | | travel time between Durham and Chapel Hill |
| | | | | | | | | | | -Ridership farebox collection only supports a small |
| | | | | | | | | | | percentage of the annual operating costs. |
| | | | | | | | | | | -A population density of 30 people per gross acre, or |
| | | | | | | | | | | roughly 19,000 people per square mile (ppsm), is |
| | | | | | | | | | | necessary in order to support light rail transit. The |
| | | | | | | | | | | Chapel Hill-Durham corridor has a population |
| | | | | | | | | | | density less than 20% of that threshold. |
| | | | | | | | | | | -The ridership projections for the D-O LRT are wildly |
| | | | | | | | | | | optimistic, with estimated daily boardings of 23,000. |
| | | | | | | | | | | -I support the NO BUILD OPTION. The projected |
| | | | | | | | | | | growth in the Triangle is predominately weighted |
| | | | | | | | | | | toward Wake County, and Wake County, with a |
| | | | | | | | | | | much larger population than Orange or Durham |
| | | | | | | | | | | Counties has rejected the Light Rail option. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Robin | Blackmon | | · | Durham | North Card | USA | 27707 | 25-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Tony | Blake | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27516 | 10-Jun-15 | Ask yourself if LRT will make for a better transit |
| | | | | | | | | | | experience and if it does, for whom. How it is |
| | | | | | | | | | | rational people justify +1.8 Billion (much more, if |
| | | | | | | | | | | other cities experiences are any guide) for an |
| | | | | | | | | | | inflexible 17 mile system through a critical |
| | | | | | | | | | | watershed that will be made mostly irrelevant by |
| | | | | | | | | | | technology before it is completed? |
| N/G | Laura | Blank | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Edward | Blasius | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jul-15 | N/G |
| mrs | pat | blasius | - | = | chapel hill | nc | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Jennifer | Blazing | | - | Chapel Hill | NORTH CA | - | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Ms. | Margaret | Boccieri | | = | Chapel Hill | North Card | | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Christopher | Boehlke | | | Durham | N/G | USA | 27707 | 1-Aug-15 | N/G |
| , 0 | Chinocophici | Docinic | | _ | Darriani | 1.1,5 | 3371 | 2,,0, | 12 1106 10 | 1.45 |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|---------|-------|---------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| Mr | Kenneth | Bogue | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 11-Oct-15 | Light rail may cost \$1,600,000,000 to construct (or more if there are cost overruns). |
| | | | | | | | | | | Light rail, in 2040, may serve up to 11,500 citizens each workday. Some reasonable projections of ridership are as low as 5,000 citizens per workday. |
| | | | | | | | | | | This is an investment of about \$140,000 to \$320,000 for each and every citizen who might benefit from a light rail system. This cost to benefit ratio does not make sense. This cost to benefit ratio is not sustainable nor affordable at the local, state, or federal level. |
| | | | | | | | | | | The proposed light rail system should not be built because it costs too much and will serve too small a portion of the 500,000 people who now reside in Orange and Durham counties. |
| | | | | | | | | | | There are other needs in our communities, especially building elementary and secondary schools and improving teachers' salaries, which would be much better places to invest \$1,600,000,000. Please do not waste this kind of money on a rail system that makes no sense. |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|-----------|-----------|--|
| Ms | Elizabeth | Bonnet | | • | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 11-Oct-15 | Light rail may cost \$1,600,000,000 to construct (or |
| | | | | | | | | | | more if there are cost overruns). |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | Light rail, in 2040, may serve up to 11,500 citizens |
| | | | | | | | | | | each workday. Some reasonable projections of |
| | | | | | | | | | | ridership are as low as 5,000 citizens per workday. |
| | | | | | | | | | | This is an investment of about \$140,000 to \$320,000 |
| | | | | | | | | | | for each and every citizen who might benefit from a |
| | | | | | | | | | | light rail system. This cost to benefit ratio does not |
| | | | | | | | | | | make sense. This cost to benefit ratio is not |
| | | | | | | | | | | sustainable nor affordable at the local, state, or |
| | | | | | | | | | | federal level. |
| | | | | | | | | | | The proposed light rail system should not be built |
| | | | | | | | | | | because it costs too much and will serve too small a |
| | | | | | | | | | | portion of the 500,000 people who now reside in |
| | | | | | | | | | | Orange and Durham counties. |
| | | | | | | | | | | There are other needs in our communities, |
| | | | | | | | | | | especially building elementary and secondary |
| | | | | | | | | | | schools and improving teachers' salaries, |
| | | | | | | | | | | which would be much better places to invest |
| | | | | | | | | | | \$1,600,000,000. Please do not waste this kind of |
| | | | | | | | | | | money on a rail system that makes no sense. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Rebecca | Bostian | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517-249 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Michael | Bostian | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517-249 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| m | Robert | Bowerman | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 3-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Kathy | Bowerman | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 3-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Laura | Bowers | | t | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Ellen | Boylan | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 26-Sep-15 | Expanded bus service is much less expensive, more |
| | | | | | | | | | | flexible, and less disruptive for our communities. |
| N/G | Richard C | Boylan Jr | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 26-Sep-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Lisa | Brach | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 23-Jun-15 | Please do not waste my taxpayer money on a system |
| | | | | | | | | | | that is doomed by its design and will ultimately have |
| | | | | | | | | | | a negative impact on my neighborhood, our |
| | | | | | | | | | | community and the whole City of Durham! |
| N/G | stephen | brackett | | | CHAPEL HILL | North Card | | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Steve | Brackett | | | chapel hill | North Card | | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Kathryn | Breen | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Walter | Brittle | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | @&%!& | 22-Sep-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Rosemary | Brookman | | | chapel hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 12-Aug-15 | Light rail is responsible for more deaths and |
| | | | | | | | | | | accidents than any other form of transportation |
| | | | | | | | | | | except motorcycles. This is a bad solution. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Enchanced bus service would solve the problem |
| | | | | | | | | | | with much less cost and much less environmental |
| | | | | | | | | | | impact. |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|----------|-------|---------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| N/G | Daniel | Bruce | - | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27514 | 11-Jun-15 | N/G |
| ms | mary | buchanan | | | Chapel Hill | nc | USA | 27517 | 1-Jul-15 | I grew up two miles from here and bought this house five years ago, as my forever home. Now there is a plan to make, literally, my backyard into the train line. I object and will continue to object until they drop the plan completely as there is not now and will never be a need for a light rail in the triangle of NC at all. |
| N/G | MEGAN | BUCKLEY | | | durham | nc | USA | 27713 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Aaron | Buckley | | | Natthews | NC | USA | 28105 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Thomas | Bulthuis | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 25-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Lauren | Burke | | _ | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Gary | Burke | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 11-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Brian | Burke | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 11-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Lauren | Burke | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Edith | Burns | | | CHAPELHILL | NC | USA | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Julie | Burson | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Eric | Butler | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 2-Sep-15 | Light rail is not the proper solution for our community. It cost too much money, will never reach sustainable ridership levels and will be a public burden. Further, it will certainly cause many fatalities which could have been avoided due to excessive at grade crossings. With regard to the local 54 corridor, it will increase congestion by usurping other more narrowly focused and thoughtful traffic solutions. With regard to Downing Creek, it will cut off access and impose a major safety risk to the hundreds of families in our neighborhood. All in all, the antiquated concept of light rail should be abandoned as outdated and intellectually dull and lazy. The area would be better served by doing nothing rather that making the elementary error of over building with an outdated technology. That type of error could not only cripple the area's economy but the progressive zeitgeist of Durham/Chapel Hill. It could have major repercussions the likes of which we here and now cannot fathom. As for Downing Creek residents, the mere existence of the train makes its far more likely that our neighbors and loved ones will come to an early preventable demise. It is just a very bad idea, indeed. |
| Ms. | Megan | Butler | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 2-Sep-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Steven | Buzinski | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Carol | Bylinski | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Freddy | Byrth | | <u></u> | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|------------|-------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| N/G | Alex | Cabanes | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | As a resident of Downing Creek, myself and others in the neighboring communities have repeatedly expressed our concerns about the impact and safety of the proposed C2/C2A at-grade routing along the NC54 corridor. Despite repeated requests and outreach by the community, GoTriangle has to date failed to address these community concerns. These concerns have been discussed on numerous occasions directly with GoTriangle representatives in public and private forums, email, phone, letters, surveys, etc. Needless to say, this is extremely frustrating for the over 90% of local residents in opposition to the C2/C2A at-grade routing who believe their voices are not being heard or interests adequately represented. As our Durham elected representatives, I request that you either ask GoTriangle to directly address these safety issues with viable alternatives or REJECT the currently proposed Light Rail project. |
| Mrs | Pam | Calderwood | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | The costs benefit is just not there for light rail - just see the amount of people taking buses between the two medical groups. Safety is also an issue regarding a neighborhood which has prided itself on family activities with small children riding bikes everywhere! |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|------------|-------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| Ms | Caroline | Cameron | | , reduces | Chapel Hill | NC NC | N/G | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | My main concern is the safety of the rail, especially the C2A route. There will be 3 at-grade crossings, two of them are the entrances to Downing Creek and all are within a 1/2 miles stretch. This is a set-up for the worst-case scenario - the train hitting a car or a bus. The traffic on NC54 comes to a stop during peak times and there will be no traffic lights guaranteeing access to NC54 and there is a real potential a car will get stuck on the tracks and the gate will come down behind the car, trapping the car. The fact that there are going to be numerous stations without parking or any additional parking is also a boondoggle. The fact that technology has moved beyond light rail is also very short sighted especially for the billions of dollars this will cost to build and the hundreds of millions is will cost each year to run. The last fact is, it is basically the train to no-where. It basically runs to Duke and UNC and not to heavy shopping areas, the park, Raleigh, or the airport. That is what the people voted on when they approved the increase in the sales tax. Talk about a bait and switch. NO to the rail, get smart and do what Raleigh is doing. |
| Mr. | Keith | Cameron | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | Please note that the vast majority of taxpayers affected by this project would not use it and DO NOT WANT IT! |
| N/G | Christina | Cameron | | | Durham | N/G | N/G | 27704 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | John | Cameron | | | Chapel Hill | North Car | o USA | 27517 | 1-Oct-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Harriet | Cannon | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27713 | 25-Aug-15 | The planning commitee of Durham is being run by folks who have little interest in the thoughts or feelings of anyone they don't consider "progressive" I have lived in Durham all my life and love the fact that it has never felt or been urban. I am not a fan of light rail and what it will do to the hometown feel of Durham. It is going to ruin a lot of nice neighborhood. If urban is where these planners want to live, they should move to or back to a big urbanized city instead of trying to change ours. |
| N/G | John | Capell | | | Mount Gilead | NC | N/G | 27306 | 6-Jul-15 | I oppose the crossing planned at Downing Creek. I am an owner in 11 town homes at Bradford place. |
| N/G | Linda | Carmichael | 1 | | Chapel Hill | North Car | o N/G | 27517 | 24-Jul-15 | N/G |

| ms maureen carroll durham nc USA 27707 5-5ep-15 please think about how much good the money or folish have to east down the drain for no good relation for no | Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|--|-------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------|-------------|---------------------|------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|---|
| N/G maureen carroll durham nc. durham USA 27707 28-Sep-15 stop spending the money on a useless proposition where is the money now? has it been used for anything? N/G Tami Carter | Title ms | FirstName maureen | Surname carroll | Email | Address | Town/City durham | | Region USA | Zip/PC 27707 | Date 5-Sep-15 | reason. money that could have been spent on the rapid transit or feeding and housing veterans, helping the homelessa million ways to spend that cash. yes, we need better transportation here, but it is beginning to look like some kind of criminal mismanagement of funds is happening and pockets are get lined and nothing is getting accomplished. i think the whole matter should be thoroughly investigate by an independent group of |
| Chapel Hill NC | N/G | maureen | carroll | | | durham | nc. durham | USA | 27707 | 28-Sep-15 | stop spending the money on a useless proposition. where is the money now? has it been used for |
| Mr. David Carter Hillsborough NC USA 27278 16-Sep-15 This light rail fiasco was shoved down the voters throats. It's not feasible or sustainable without punishing the citzens further. Why not use existing rail lines with a LOT less money? N/G Mary Carter Hillsborough NC USA 27278 22-Sep-15 N/G N/G David Carter Hillsborough NC USA 27278 22-Sep-15 N/G Mrs. Jennifer Cayless Capless Chapel Hill NC USA 27278 22-Sep-15 N/G Mrs. Jennifer Cayless Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 10-Jun-15 N/G N/G Brian Chacos Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 11-Jun-15 N/G N/G Ryan Chamberlain NC USA 27517 19-Jun-15 N/G Durham NC USA 27707 19-Aug-15 Highway noise is already unbearable. Light pollut already toxic to the atmosphere. Too much EXPENSE and not enough SENSE to connect this to a reas where people NeEEO mass trainst who is deadowmont would need to ride a train due to I income? Atgrade crossings are probably the work on part of all of this in this reason train on this entire coast are problematic is because of grade crossings accordents, traffic backup. | N/G | Tami | Carter | | | Chanel Hill | NC | LICA | 27517 | 25-lup-15 | |
| N/G David Carter Mrs. Jennifer Cayless Dr Hugh Cayless N/G Brian Chacos Mr Ryan Chamberlain Mr Ryan NC USA 27517 11-Jun-15 N/G Mr NC USA 27517 19-Aug-15 Highway noise is already unbearable. Light pollut already toxic to the atmosphere. Too much EXPENSE and not enough SENSE to connect this to to areas where people NEED mass transit who in Meadowmont would need to ride a train due to I income? At-grade crossings are probably the work part of all of this in this area. A huge reason train on this entire coast are problematic is because of grade crossings. Crossing accidents, traffic backuy low train speeds; all of this is going to spell disast at these crossings especially. | | - | | | | | | | | | This light rail fiasco was shoved down the voters throats. It's not feasible or sustainable without punishing the citizens further. Why not use existing |
| N/G David Carter Mrs. Jennifer Cayless Dr Hugh Cayless N/G Brian Chacos Mr Ryan Chamberlain Mr Ryan NC USA 27517 11-Jun-15 N/G Mr NC USA 27517 19-Aug-15 Highway noise is already unbearable. Light pollut already toxic to the atmosphere. Too much EXPENSE and not enough SENSE to connect this to to areas where people NEED mass transit who in Meadowmont would need to ride a train due to I income? At-grade crossings are probably the work part of all of this in this area. A huge reason train on this entire coast are problematic is because of grade crossings. Crossing accidents, traffic backuy low train speeds; all of this is going to spell disast at these crossings especially. | N/G | Mary | Carter | | | Hillshorough | NC | LISΔ | 27278 | 22-Sen-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. Jennifer Cayless Dr Hugh Cayless N/G Brian Chacos Mr Ryan Chamberlain NC USA 27517 10-Jun-15 N/G Chapel Hill No USA 27517 11-Jun-15 N/G Chamberlain NC USA 27707 19-Aug-15 Highway noise is already unbearable. Light pollut already toxic to the atmosphere. Too much EXPENSE and not enough SENSE to connect this to areas where people NEED mass transit who i Meadowmont would need to ride a train due to I income? At-grade crossings are probably the wor part of all of this in this area. A huge reason train on this entire coast are problematic is because of grade crossings. Crossing accidents, traffic backup low train speeds; all of this is going to spell disast at these crossings especially. | | | | | | | | | | | , |
| Dr Hugh Cayless N/G Brian Chacos Mr Ryan Chamberlain NC USA 27517 11-Jun-15 N/G Highway noise is already unbearable. Light pollut already toxic to the atmosphere. Too much EXPENSE and not enough SENSE to connect this to areas where people NEED mass transit who i Meadowmont would need to ride a train due to I income? At-grade crossings are probably the wor part of all of this in this area. A huge reason train on this entire coast are problematic is because of grade crossings. Crossing accidents, traffic backul low train speeds; all of this is going to spell disast at these crossings especially. | | | + | | | | | | | • | , |
| N/G Brian Chacos Chapel Hill No USA 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G Mr Ryan Chamberlain Durham NC USA 27707 19-Aug-15 Highway noise is already unbearable. Light pollut already toxic to the atmosphere. Too much EXPENSE and not enough SENSE to connect this to areas where people NEED mass transit who i Meadowmont would need to ride a train due to I income? At-grade crossings are probably the wor part of all of this in this area. A huge reason train on this entire coast are problematic is because of grade crossings. Crossing accidents, traffic backuy low train speeds; all of this is going to spell disast at these crossings especially. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ryan Chamberlain Durham NC USA 27707 19-Aug-15 Highway noise is already unbearable. Light pollut already toxic to the atmosphere. Too much EXPENSE and not enough SENSE to connect this to areas where people NEED mass transit who i Meadowmont would need to ride a train due to I income? At-grade crossings are probably the woin part of all of this in this area. A huge reason train on this entire coast are problematic is because of grade crossings. Crossing accidents, traffic backup low train speeds; all of this is going to spell disast at these crossings especially. | | _ | | | - | • | | | | | |
| | | Ryan | Chamberlain | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | - | EXPENSE and not enough SENSE to connect this train to areas where people NEED mass transit who in Meadowmont would need to ride a train due to low-income? At-grade crossings are probably the worst part of all of this in this area. A huge reason trains on this entire coast are problematic is because of at-grade crossings. Crossing accidents, traffic backups, low train speeds; all of this is going to spell disaster |
| IN/G Allison IChandler | N/G | Allison | Chandler | | 1 | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|-------|---------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| N/G | Suzanne and Steve | Chaney | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 11-Oct-15 | We have free buses in Chapel Hill and they run empty. Why does one think they will ride a train that they have to pay for. |
| | | | | | | | | | | The low income individuals don't have the money to pay for a train ticket. |
| | | | | | | | | | | The majority of people have their own cars and are not going to give up their time (the train transit time is long than it takes to drive from Chapel Hill to Durham) nor their freedom they enjoy with their carthey go and come on their own schedule not the train schedule. They have transportation when they get to Durham. They don't have to find a way to get from the Durham train station to their destination. If they drive their car, they can drive directly to their destination. |
| Mrs | Pal | Cheema | | | Chapel hill | Durham | N/G | 27251 | 24-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Zibin | Chen | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Dawn | Chin-Quee | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 26-Jul-15 | I live in the area of Farrington and already have problems with traffic getting to I-40 and 54 from Farrington. Also, I don't want the value of my condo to be compromised by Light Rail project. |
| N/G | Kathleen | Christian | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 17-Jul-15 | This train is massively expensive to build and will drain funds from future transit needs with operation and maintenance costs over 16 million per year. It harms multiple neighborhoods that its tracks border, both by destroying air-cleaning, sound-buffering trees and by creating unsafe at-grade train-auto intersections. The results are higher air pollution, increased sound pollution from nearby highways such as Rt 54 and I-40, and dangerous, traffic bottlenecks at the car-train intersections. All this to decrease the need for bus service at Duke and UNC medical centers, which could be optimized with busonly lanes for the last mile near these busy centers for possibly a BILLION less dollars! Without hurting so many existing neighborhoods! And leaving the flexibility that the system will need as ground transportation is massively changed by autonomous vehicles. See stopthetrain.org for more details. |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|------------|-------|--------------|-------------|------------|--------|---------|-----------|--|
| Mrs. | Kathleen | Cimo | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | This plan will be devastating to Downing Creek and will without a doubt adversely affect the neighborhood and its property values. Further, it will increase congestion on the already- congested Route 54E, which will cause traffic to backup into Downing Creek. |
| Mr | Brent | Clark | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 15-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Cindy | Clark | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 16-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Brent | Clark | | <u>l</u> | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 15-Sep-15 | N/G |
| MS | AMY | CLAYTON | | | DURHAM | NC | N/G | 27707 | 26-Jul-15 | STOP THE LIGHT RAIL AND SUBSTATION!!! |
| N/G | David | Cocchetto | | | Durham | N/G | USA | 27707 | 25-Sep-15 | N/G |
| Ms | maria | coleman | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | This is partially what Meadowmont was designed for, and that would be the perfect place just as originally layer out. |
| N/G | Rodalyn | Coleman | | | chapel hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | I reject Farrington Road as a location for Rail Operations and Maintenance Facility. My home is located directly across the street and the maintenance facility poses both a major health risk, as well as a traffic problem. My tax dollars should be spent on education not on premier expensive seats for a small number of people. |
| N/G | Rodalyn | Coleman | | | Chapel Hill | Durham | USA | 27517 | 26-Jul-15 | I strongly oppose the Go Triangle Lite Rail because the cost hits me as a tax payer on the Federal, state and local levels and will continue to take my retirement and use in wasteful spending to keep up with the deteriorating conditions of the lite rail. |
| Mr | Ron | Coltrane | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 12-Jun-15 | I'm afraid the development of the land will decrease property values in the Downing Creek and Meadowmont area where I own. |
| mr | john | conklin | | · | durham | NC | USA | 27807 | 12-Aug-15 | No light rail PLEASR |
| Mr | Paul | Coon | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 25-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Paul | Coon | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Sep-15 | Does not meet the master plan with the growth trends in the region. |
| ms. | Wallis | Cooper | | | Chapel Hill | NC - North | | 27517 | 3-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Rand | Cork | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | Light rail is trying to fill a need that doesn't exist - waste of money & threat to our neighborhoods. |
| N/G | Belinda | Corpening | | + | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517B5 | 27-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | John | Corpening | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Helen | Courvoisie | | - | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Susan | Cowart | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 9-Oct-15 | Delay this project for further consideration of a solution that will connect Durham and Orange Counties with Wake County. |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|-------------|-------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| Dr. | Doug | Cowart | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 9-Oct-15 | WE must delay this project for further consideration of a solution that will connect Durham and Orange Counties with Wake County. A single line through low density areas is a BAD idea. There is simply no evidence that this light rail is needed at this time. Transit needs are better served in a fiscally responsible manner by expansion of the bus services and establish of bus lanes on surface highways. The costs and the proposed route are ill advised, and do NOT address the needs of the population growth area. The ultimate effect on taxes and the funding sources are not clear. |
| N/G | Laura | Сох | | | Durham | Durham | USA | 27705 | 30-Sep-15 | There is no need for this stilted version of public transit which does not serve routes of greatest use such as the airport or Wake County, whose residents were smart enough to stop this effort in its tracks. |
| N/G | Hunter | Crandall | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Claudia | Crassweller | | | Chapel Hill | | N/G | 27517 | 10-Oct-15 | Please stop this gross misuse of our county and state tax dollars for a poorly thought out plan that reaches too few people. You will be placing a burden on us and the people who live in the affected areas in the future. Billions of dollars is not worth throwing away for the very few people who will utilize this service. The route is not logical or useful for the amount being spent. Get an outside source for making this decision. If Wake County opted out with their large population, how do you think it will work for much smaller counties. Stop this madness. |
| N/G | Peter | Crassweller | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 10-Oct-15 | I am all for mass transit, but for the amount of money being used by this plan is not justified. I don't want the cost associated with this plan to be sucking the money out of my wallet. This is crazy! Why doesn't this involve transportation to RTP, Southpoint, or the airport. Those would increase the potential for ridership. Our counties are not large enough to support this kind of expensive system. Stop! |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|------------|------------|---------------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| ms | sheila | creth | | | chapel hill | orange cou | USA | 27514 | 10-Jun-15 | This is an extraordinary expense & disruption for what may be a limited ridership between UNC & Duke universities. Why not consider a light rail line to provide Chatham & Orange county residents a fast way to get to areas of Chapel Hill & Durham (not just the universities). Or a light rain line from Chatham to Raleigh (parallel to I 40) with a Chapel Hill to Raleigh include the RT park! Now that's lots of people. |
| Ms | Caroline | Crocker | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 29-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Charles | Crocker | - | - | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 29-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Henrietta | Croom | 7 | | Chapel Hill | North Caro | | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Lorna Lynn | Culton | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | I don't support the proposed rail. Stats on systems in other areas (larger than Durham and Chapel Hill) indicate that rails become a financial burden to taxpayers and ticket prices bring in less than 1/4 the operating cost. I would rather see my taxpayer money go to towards upgrading the current bus service, which would give riders more destinations and be financially self sufficient. The glamor of a train is no comparison to the functionality of an upgraded commuter bus system and not worth the money! I would like to see dedicated lanes for busses with enhancements made to the bus stops (like at the airport) and to the busses (offering WiFi and more comfortable seating as airport shuttles). I visualize commuters working on laptops or watching CNN on overhead screens while on their commute to work. If busses were to become more attractive, ridership will go up and still serve the same purpose as the rail without the disruption to neighboring communities and the burden to taxpayers. Why not take the lead of Raleigh and Wake County? They see the rail as a losing proposition and are finding alternatives that make more sense. Please don't let this monstrosity ruin our area! |
| N/G | Gail | Culton | | 1 | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | Waste of our tax money. Improve bus service like our neighbors in Raleigh instead. |
| N/G | Patrick | Culton | | | chaple hill | North Caro | USA | 27517 | 1-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Donna | Culton | | | Chapel Hill | N.C. | USA | 27517 | 4-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Lynda | Cunningham | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Oct-15 | Choose the "NO Build" Alternative and build as Bus Rapid Transit system that can be integrated into Wake County's plan for BRT. Then there will be public transportation to RTP. Light Rail is too expensive, and the technology is obsolete |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|------------------|----------|-------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| N/G | Patrick | Curley | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | Originally concerned about the routes proposed and at grade crossing safety and traffic issues. Upon review, now very concerned about financial viability and the permanent subsidy Light Rail will require, and tremendous safety issues. We can do better with a 1.8 Billion dollar budget. |
| Mrs. | Wendy | Curtis | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27514 | 24-Jun-15 | The placement of this rail system will snarl the ALREADY awful traffic that is around the Barbee Chapel Road Chapel Hill. |
| N/G | Nan M. | Cushing | | | Durham | N/G | N/G | 27707 | 20-Sep-15 | Small buses with wider routes could be more conveient and less expensive. |
| N/G | Katherine | Dancel | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 25-Aug-15 | Meadowmont was designed with the Light Rail in mind. The intersections with Hwy 54 near the Friday Center are already extremely congested. Please reconsider! |
| N/G | Karima and Shiva | Das | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | NO to the Durham/Orange Co. light rail train! Makes no sensethe buses that go back and forth b/t orange and Durham co have a minimal amount of passengers. It would make more sense to fill these hybrid buses first before even thinking of embarking on this very expensive light rail project and all of its ramifications. |
| Mrs | Patricia | Daves | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | Highway 54 is already very congested so I don't think the Light Rail Train should be built thus adding to the congestion. |
| Ms | Kathryn | Davis | | | Chapel Hill | N. C. | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Nancy W | Davis | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 1-Oct-15 | The light rail as presently proposed does not make sense. At the speeds proposed, bus transportation works without disrupting neighborhoods. |
| N/G | M. | de Bruyn | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | USA | 27516 | 10-Jun-15 | N/G |
| DR | Ellen | De Flora | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 22-Aug-15 | The proposed light rail system for the Durham Chapel Hill area will hurt communities and not help alleviate the congestion of the area. The ROMF are placed in areas not designated for industrial use and will dirty up areas that were meant for communities, small businesses and schools. Other more flexible and cost effective alternatives should be sought. |
| Ms | Allison | Deal | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Trish | Dean | | | Durham | North Carc | USA | 27707 | 24-Jul-15 | Decision making about the location of stations, atgrade crossings and ROMF seem very narrow-minded and not keeping in mind the new reality this will create for the people who live and travel in those areas. |
| N/G | Heath | Dedmond | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 25-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Molly | Dempsey | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 11-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Kathleen | Dennis | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|------------|-------|--------------|--------------|------------|--------|----------|-----------|---|
| mr. | Luther | Dennis | | | Chapel Hill | nC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms. | Ashley | DeSena | | _ | Hillsborough | North Card | USA | 27278 | 1-Oct-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Nancy | Dewhirst | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Mark | Dewhirst | | - | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms. | Barbara | Dickinson | | - | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 24-Jul-15 | I STRONGLY OPPOSE the placement of the Light Rail |
| | | | | | | | | | | maintenance facility being placed in the peaceful, |
| | | | | | | | | | | heavily-residential area on Farrington Road in |
| | | | | | | | | | | Durham and the passenger station in Downing Creek |
| | | | | | | | | | | in CHAPEL HILL. The placement of both facilities will |
| | | | | | | | | | | create tremendous traffic problems to already- |
| | | | | | | | | | | existing overloaded traffic congestion, extensive |
| | | | | | | | | | | noise issues for peaceful residential areas, and thel |
| | | | | | | | | | | decrease in property values for hundreds of homes |
| | | | | | | | | | | not to mention the eminent domain of many |
| | | | | | | | | | | decades-long residents. |
| | | | | | | | | | | VOTE with a heart; listen to your constituents; place |
| | | | | | | | | | | these two transit facilities in an industrial section on |
| | | | | | | | | | | Cornwallis in Durham; that area is suited for such |
| | | | | | | | | | | uses. |
| | | | | | | | | | | SAY NO TO RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT! |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dr. | Margie | Dietz | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27705 | 21-Aug-15 | My perception is that the route has been so |
| ы. | iviaigie | Dietz | | | Dulliani | IVC | UJA | 27703 | 21-Aug-13 | compromised at this point, it no longer serves the |
| | | | | | | | | | | needs of the citizens of Durham. |
| N/G | L | DiGiovanni | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 27-Sep-15 | I am concerned that the rail is cutting off access to |
| , 0 | _ | 2.0.0.0 | | | onaper riiii | 1,75 | 1,, 5 | 2,31, | 27 000 10 | the main roads for emergency vehicles and causing |
| | | | | | | | | | | danger for residents of Downing Creek subdivision. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ms | Anna | Dnegan | | • | Chapel Hill | Nc | USA | 27517 | 10-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Carol | Dodge | | _ | CHAPEL HILL | NC - North | | 2.75E+08 | 7-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Patricia | Dorsch | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Ernst | Dorsch | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | John | Dorward | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | James | Doughty | | 1 | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 13-Jun-15 | I am pro-transit and pro-future. But this project has |
| | | | | | | | | | | been planned along illogical lines to serve certain |
| | | | | | | | | | | people's interests. Our civil attempts to steer it in a |
| | | | | | | | | | | rational direction were met with deaf ears. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Opposing the whole thing is our only remaining option. I hope this course of action is scrapped and |
| | | | | | | | | | | that the Triangle starts over to design a rail system |
| | | | | | | | | | | that will actually serve people's needs. |
| | | | | | | | | | | that will actually serve people's fleeds. |
| Ms. | Donna | Douglas | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Michael | Douglas | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Danielle | Doyle | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 17-Sep-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Nancy | Drozd | | | LEXINGTON | NC | USA | 27295 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Edward | Drozd | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 12-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Steven | Drysdale | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 25-Jul-15 | Not in favor of the construction of the maintenance |
| | | | | | | | | | | facility for light rail so close to our neighborhood. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|-------------|-------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|----------|-----------|--|
| N/G | Mary Jo | Dunnington | | • | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Jean | Durham | | _ | Chapel Hill | North Card | N/G | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Beverly | Dyer | | - | Chapel Hill | North Card | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Sam | Dyer | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | 1. Costs: 1.05B to Durham according to the Durham |
| | | ' | | | | | | | | County Bus and LRT plan. Read ODU State of the |
| | | | | | | | | | | region report, construction delays and cost overruns |
| | | | | | | | | | | are endemic with LRT const, according to the |
| | | | | | | | | | | American J. of Planning, costs are up to 40% greater |
| | | | | | | | | | | than estimates, either miscalculating costs or initial |
| | | | | | | | | | | low ball from contractors to secure contracts. |
| | | | | | | | | | | 2. Safety: LRT death rate (not counting suicide) 5-10 |
| | | | | | | | | | | times greater than bussource US DOT, nearly all |
| | | | | | | | | | | are pedestrians at grade crossings |
| | | | | | | | | | | 3. Gentrification of east Durham: Multiple studies |
| | | | | | | | | | | show this around Urban LRT stations |
| | | | | | | | | | | 4. Who is going to ride it: Read the 2011 city and |
| | | | | | | | | | | county issue guide from the John Locke Foundation. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Very few riders, and many of those will come from |
| | | | | | | | | | | prior bus riders who no longer have service (gotta |
| | | | | | | | | | | pay for it somehow) |
| | | | | | | | | | | 5. Decrease property value: Read Impact of LRT on |
| | | | | | | | | | | residential property value (PV) in Houston by |
| | | | | | | | | | | Qisheng Pan, multiple studies and analysis show a |
| | | | | | | | | | | significant decrease in PV 1/4 mile from the station; |
| | | | | | | | | | | that will affect a significant number of homes in the |
| | | | | | | | | | | Oaks, Downing Creek and Meadowmont. |
| | | | | | | | | | | 6. Visual and asthetic issue, Downing Creek residents |
| | | | | | | | | | | will have high exposure and sensitivity to an |
| | | | | | | | | | | LRT/statn |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| N/G | jeff | earley | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 23-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Jessica | Edwards | | · . | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | larry | eimers | | 1 | durham | nc | N/G | 27705 | 30-Aug-15 | ridiculous waste of money with poor planning! |
| Mr | Peter | Einaudi | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27157 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Mary | Elkins | | <u></u> | Chapel hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 29-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Kathryn | Enchelmayer | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | Although I believe the Light Rail is a good thing, I |
| | | | | | | | | | | don't understand why it cannot be on the other side |
| | | | | | | | | | | of Hwy 54 from Downing Creek where there is no |
| | | | | | | | | | | development. |
| Capt | Peter | Enchelmayer | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 2.75E+08 | 9-Jun-15 | The concept of a train isworth consideration, |
| | | | | | | | | | | however, locating the tracks across NC54 would not |
| | | | | | | | | | | negatively affect our neighborhood as much as |
| | | | | | | | | | | current plans. Rush hour egress/ingress would be |
| | | | | | | | | | | f'd up severely were the current options selected. |
| | | | | | | | | | | · |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|----------|-------|---------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| N/G | Thomas | Englund | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 27-Jul-15 | This is a poor plan that will impact hundreds of homeowners in a very negative way. It will never pay off and will cost all area taxpayers an incredible amount of money so that very few can take a train to and from work every day. Go Triangle has been dishonest with the public, steadfastly adhering to their current proposal in a desperate effort to get the project underway. Please investigate further without relying on their numbers or projections. Please look into the stories of the families who will be displaced or otherwise damaged. Please investigate the environmental damage that will be caused by the ROMF on Farrington Road. |
| Ms | Sharon | Epstein | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27514 | 10-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Stanley | Epstein | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 1-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Carolyn | Epstein | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 1-Aug-15 | This project is not good for the area and is far too expensive, and benefits too few to justify the huge expense. Lets expand the bus service at very much less expense. |
| Ms | Susan | Erickson | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 29-Jun-15 | Originally, RDU and RTP were to be included as part of the plan. After Wake County opted out, this was no longer possible. The present plan shows that the rail line will originate at UNC Hospitals with stops at DUMC and other locations on Hwy 54 and 15-501. and end on Alston Ave near the intersection with Hwy55. This will create traffic nightmares on roads that are already congested with traffic, and disrupt established neighborhoods along the route. There is already dependable bus service which travels the same route as the proposed train. This train will cost billions, and ridership will be limited. It would make sense to stop the project now, and consider other options (improved bus routes, eco friendly buses, designated bus lanes on !40 to RDU and RTP). There are also plans to build a Rail Operations and Maintenance Facility on Farrington Rd on 25 acres of land near Ephesus Church Rd that is presently zoned for Residential use. Commercial development on land bordering the facility is also planned. This is totally unacceptable for neighborhoods and schools near the site. Let's stop this project now before it is too late. Wake Co, said "no". Let's be wise and do the same |
| Mr | Eugene | Eschmann | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 25-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs | Bren | Eskridge | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 25-Jul-15 | How can light rail be justified when people are not even using the buses. |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|------------|-------|---------|-------------|----------|--------|--------|------------|--|
| N/G | Marsha | Fancher | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 25-Jul-15 | This project is far too expensive for the tax payer to |
| | | | | | | | | | | support when other transit alternatives can be |
| | | | | | | | | | | identified that are far less costly. The estimated |
| | | | | | | | | | | number of riders is in excess of the standard |
| | | | | | | | | | | percentages of ridership across the country (Source:: |
| | | | | | | | | | | Quarterly and Annual Totals by Mode - collected by |
| | | | | | | | | | | American Public Transportation Association) |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mrs | Rebekah | Farris | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Charlie | Farris | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Lida | fay | | | Chapel hill | nc | USA | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | margaret | fetters | | | chapel hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | paul | fitts | | | Raleigh | North Ca | | 27615 | 16-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Marilyn | Flanary | | | Durham | North Ca | | 27707 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Gita | Fleischman | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 15-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Jeremy | Force | | 1 | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 25-Jul-15 | We request the rail system not be built near or on Farrington Road. |
| N/G | Jenny | Force | | ! | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 26-Jul-15 | As a local Farrington home owner, I reject the idea |
| | | | | | | | | | | of putting a light rail maintenance facility on |
| | | | | | | | | | | Farrington Rd. |
| Mr | Dick | Ford | | | Durham | NC | USA | 276517 | 8-Jun-15 | Chapel Hill and UNC must be held accountable for |
| | | | | | | | | | | their routing preferences adopted by GoTriangle. |
| | | | | | | | | | | They are using light occupancy rail for their elite |
| | | | | | | | | | | interests. Look at how GoTriangle has turned its |
| | | | | | | | | | | back on East Durham and the Judea campus. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | How many at-grade crossings do Chapel Hill |
| | | | | | | | | | | neighborhoods face??? Why is light occupancy |
| | | | | | | | | | | transit elevated thru the UNC Campus at a cost of |
| | | | | | | | | | | millions, but not for our neighborhoods?? |
| N/C | Danaman | Ford | | | Chanal IIII | NC | N/C | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | |
| N/G | Rosemary | Ford | | 1 | Chapel Hill | INC | N/G | 2/51/ | 10-1011-15 | It has been very disheartening to see the process by |
| | | | | | | | | | | which the light rail plan has been maderife with |
| | | | | | | | | | | favoritism toward the wealthy city of Chapel Hill and disregard for the interests of East Durham (as well as |
| | | | | | | | | | | my own neighborhood of Downing Creek.) |
| | | | | | | | | | | my own neighborhood of bowning creek. |
| mrs | Cheryl | Fox | | + | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Mike | Fox | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Morgan | Fox | | | Chapel hill | North Ca | | 27517 | 9-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | John | Frackoviak | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 1-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Frances | Freedman | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Joel | Freelander | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 9-Oct-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Susan N | Friel | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | I oppose the development and construction of the |
| | | | | | | | | | | Durham - Orange county Light Rail Train System. |
| Ms | Donna | Fudale | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Edward | Fudale | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| N/G | Deborah | Fulghieri | | , notices | Chapel Hill | North Caro | _ | 27517 | 29-Sep-15 | I oppose this high-cost, low-efficiency light rail project, because -on its western half, it is to be built on protected Jordan reservoir lands; -it is designed to serve primarily tax-exempt properties in Orange County (Friday Center, Mason Farm Road, UNC Hospitals); -it explicitly assumes that the CHC School District will sell Glenwood Elementary School to developers (per the Chapel Hill Transportation Planning Manager to the Planning Board); -all of Orange County is paying into this plan which does not serve the Chapel Hill's 15-501 commercial corridor; -and finally, I hate the Orwellian use of "preferred route" by GoTriangle to describe the route through Jordan reservoir lands, when it is obvious that no one prefers it. Chapel Hill is building densely everywhere but along this proposed rail line. |
| N/G | Paul | Gala | | | Chapel hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Carol | Garth | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 25-Jun-15 | This limited ridership is served well by busses and the proposed location for rail and vehicle maintenance facility is targeted for a zoned residential area. I am concerned about increase in crime as people have unrestricted access to a residential area with limited access at the present time, the impact on housing values, and impeding traffic flow for an already overly trafficked road being Farrington Rd. the planned rail crossings will only worsen the already bad situation especially during peak hours. We don't need this rail service. It is duplicating bus service already provided and is a waste of tax money needed elsewhere. |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| N/G | David | Gavin | davidgavin@bellsou | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | Without a direct line to RDU airport from downtown |
| | | | | | | | | | | Chapel Hill AND from downtown Durham, this |
| | | | | | | | | | | project is a complete waste of taxpayer dollars. |
| | | | | | | | | | | There is no possible way non rush-hour traffic (or |
| | | | | | | | | | | rush-hour traffic for that matter) between Durham |
| | | | | | | | | | | and Chapel Hill is creating sufficient congestion to |
| | | | | | | | | | | warrant such an expenditure. In fact, based upon |
| | | | | | | | | | | the design layout of the system, traffic congestion |
| | | | | | | | | | | will only increase, particularly along the highway 54 |
| | | | | | | | | | | section of the plan near exit 273 on I-40. And if the |
| | | | | | | | | | | goal of the plan is to provide transportation to those |
| | | | | | | | | | | unable to afford an car, the existing bus system is |
| | | | | | | | | | | already providing that service more than adequately |
| | | | | | | | | | | and with less intrusiveness to the infrastructures of |
| | | | | | | | | | | residential neighborhoods. The only people who |
| | | | | | | | | | | support this plan are hospital workers at Duke and |
| | | | | | | | | | | UNC, individuals who have invested time and/or |
| | | | | | | | | | | money in the plan, and government officials who |
| | | | | | | | | | | want to force this system on the community due to |
| | | | | | | | | | | their own vanity and/or lust for power. There is not |
| | | | | | | | | | | a single person I have spoken to in the last year that |
| | | | | | | | | | | supports this project that wasn't in one of these |
| | | | | | | | | | | groups. This project is more self serving than it is |
| | | | | | | | | | | community serving. |
| | | | | | | | | | | , , |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ms | Julia | Geddings | | - | Chapel Hill | N/G | USA | 27517 | 15-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Weston | Geddings | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27514 | 15-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Bernard | Geller | | | Chapel hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Eric | Ghysels | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 23-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | James | Gibson | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | USA | 27517 | 12-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Karen | Gibson | 」 | | Chapel Hill | N/G | USA | 27517 | 12-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | James | Gibson | _ | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 14-Jul-15 | No to light rail |
| Mrs | Charlotte | gilbert | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 26-Jul-15 | Using Farrington Road is a terrible idea!! South |
| | | | | | | | | | | Point or 15/501 would be a better use of land - |
| | | | | | | | | | | Please do not build on Farrington Rd |
| N/G | Bill | Gilbert | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Aug-15 | This is a big waste of tax payer money. A train that |
| | | | | | | | | | | goes nowhere and picks up no one. |
| N/G | Tyler | Glasco | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | USA | 27517 | 28-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Richard | Glover | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | | 27517 | 25-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Desiree | Goldman | | | CHAPEL HILL | NC | USA | 27514 | 20-Aug-15 | N/G |
| ms | shari | Goldstein | _ | | chapel hill | nc | USA | 27516 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Avery | Goldstein | | 1 | Chapel Hill | Durham | USA | 27517 | 25-Jun-15 | Do not destroy the most family friendly area in |
| | | | | | | | | | | Durham! Why would you build a light rail that no |
| | | | | | | | | 1 | | one will ride? Please spend the funds improving our |
| | | | | | | | | | | schools and become a city others look to as a model |
| | | | | | | | | | | instead of a place people make fun of! |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|-------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|--------|--------|--|---|
| N/G | Susan | Goldstein | | • | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 25-Jun-15 | Have you seen the back-up on Farrington Road |
| | | | | | | | | | | during rush hour? There must be a better place for |
| | | | | | | | | | | this! |
| Mr. | Buddy | Golubiewski | | • | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 9-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | kimberly | gooden | | - | Raleigh | N/G | N/G | 27606 | 27-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Len | Grande | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Sep-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Jim | Green | | - | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 10-Oct-15 | The project as it is currently conceived is |
| | | | | | | | | | | -based on fundamentally unsound ridership |
| | | | | | | | | | | projections and will not result in any appreciable |
| | | | | | | | | | | reduction in automobile congestion in the Chapel |
| | | | | | | | | | | Hill-Durham road corridor. |
| | | | | | | | | | | -the routing of the proposed light rail track is not |
| | | | | | | | | | | aligned with the higher density compact |
| | | | | | | | | | | neighborhood developments in Orange and |
| | | | | | | | | | | Chatham counties. |
| | | | | | | | | | 1 | -there is no incentive to take light rail to reduce |
| | | | | | | | | | | travel time between Durham and Chapel Hill |
| | | | | | | | | | | -Ridership farebox collection only supports a small |
| | | | | | | | | | | percentage of the annual operating costs. |
| | | | | | | | | | | -A population density of 30 people per gross acre, or |
| | | | | | | | | | | roughly 19,000 people per square mile (ppsm), is |
| | | | | | | | | | | necessary in order to support light rail transit. The |
| | | | | | | | | | | Chapel Hill-Durham corridor has a population |
| | | | | | | | | | | density less than 20% of that threshold. |
| | | | | | | | | | | -The ridership projections for the D-O LRT are wildly |
| | | | | | | | | | | optimistic, with estimated daily boardings of 23,000. |
| | | | | | | | | | | -I support the NO BUILD OPTION. The projected |
| | | | | | | | | | | growth in the Triangle is predominately weighted |
| | | | | | | | | | | toward Wake County, and Wake County, with a |
| | | | | | | | | | | much larger population than Orange or Durham |
| | | | | | | | | | | Counties has rejected the Light Rail option. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dr | Sandra | Greene | _ | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Margaret | Gresham | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | This will ruin my neighborhood. |
| N/G | Maggie | Griffin | \dashv | _ | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 15-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Shauna | Griffin | _ | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mrs | Erika | Griffin | | | Chapel hill | Nc | USA | 27514 | 14-Sep-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Albert | Gusman | _ | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Stacy | Hagerty | - | | Chapel HIII | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Jan | Halle | | 1 | 1002 Arrowhead Ro | Chapel Hill | USA | 27514 | 4-Jul-15 | This light rail is a ruse. Lots of money and effort has |
| | | | | | | | | | 1 | been put into something that must be lining |
| | | | | | | | | | | someone's pocket. There is not significant |
| | | | | | | | | | | population density to support it. Who benefits I |
| | | | | | 21 1 | | | | | don't know but someone. |
| Mr | Steven | Hamelly | _ | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Martha | Hamlett | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 12-Oct-15 | Needs more study |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|------------|--------------|--------------------|-------|---------|-------------------------|------------|--------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Dr | David | Hardman | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 20-Sep-15 | The Durham Orange Light Rail Transit proposal is no longer cost effective, nor does it address the commuting needs of the entire metropolitan Triangle area. Improving bus service and frequency in the Durham-Orange corridor will be cheaper, flexible, sustainable, and will minimize negative environmental impact. I am a fan of mass transit in general, but this proposal is misguided and not a viable plan. |
| Ms | Cheryl | Hardman | | | Chapel Hill | Nc | USA | 27517 | 22-Sep-15 | I am opposed to light rail in Orange and Durham counties. It is a waste of tax funds because it is not a high traffic area vs ch to RTP. Low ridership on existing buses. |
| N/G N/G | Jack Toby | Harless Harrell | | _ | Chapel Hill Chapel Hill | NORTH CA | USA | 27517 27517 27517 | 24-Jun-15 8-Jun-15 | This electric rail system is not needed for the traffic between Durham and Chapel Hill It is unsafe, based on statistics in other cities. It is unfunded by at least 40 percent and could be higher with cost over runs. It is old technology. As a millenial, I prefer using uber or my own car. It is not connecting to anything in Wake County, the airport or Southpoint where I may actually use it . N/G Review this D-O rail routing. As it stands, it is significantly hazardous and a major inconvenience to those of us east of the proposed line. |
| N/G | Cheryl | Harrell | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | Reject the Durham-Orange Light Rail project. It is disruptive to neighborhoods and is not cost effective. Instead increase bus frequency and route coverage. |
| Ms | Bette | Harrington | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Diane | Hartley | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Sep-15 | I share a desire to solve congestion and traffic issues. This light rail, as currently planned, does neither. |
| N/G | Barbara | Harwell | | | Sanford | NC | USA | 27330 | 24-Jun-15 | I own property on the corner of Barbee Chapel & Pearl Lane & am very concerned about the number and frequency of highway crossings and safety issues. |
| Mr. | Thomas | Hauck | | | Pittsboro | North Card | USA | 27312 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Bonnie | Hauser | | | Hillsborough | N/G | N/G | 27278 | 10-Jun-15 | |
| N/G | Kathleen | Havlin | | | Chapel hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 25-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Erika | Hawkins | | | Winston Salem | NC | USA | 27104 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Michelle | Hayward | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 9-Oct-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------------|----------|-------|------------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| Dr. | Robert | Healy | | | Durham | NC | N/G | 27705 | 18-Aug-15 | The LRT line between Durham and Chapel will do almost nothing to relieve congestion on 15-501, has an astronomical cost per rider, will have impacts on neighborhoods and on wetlands, and will drain funds for personalized transit for the elderly and disabled. A very poor investment. |
| Mrs | Denise | Heil | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | James | Heil | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | I believe the massive expenditures for this rail system are an ineffective way to use taxpayer money. The GoTriangle buses already cover this route. If demand increases, just add more buses! The cost is minimal compared to a train. I've heard bus and train funding are considered separately. This needs to be combined to ensure fiscal responsibility. If a train is inevitable, it needs to run to the RTP and Raleigh, not UNC to Duke. |
| Mr. | D. Bruce | Henschel | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 2-Sep-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Rosemary | Herbst | | | Chapel Hill | N.C. | N/G | 27514 | 22-Jun-15 | Totally against Light Rail. |
| Mrs | Belinda | Hereghty | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs | Anne | Heymann | | | Chapel Hill | Nc | USA | 27517 | 12-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Wesley | Heymann | | t | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 4-Jul-15 | Does not go to the airport so not a fan. |
| N/G | N | Hibbard | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 4-Oct-15 | I don't think it is "enough" and the "shed" is a major issue in terms of appearance/traffic, etc. |
| Dr | Anthony | Hickey | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 23-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Steve | Hicks | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Lydia | Hill | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Peter | Hinkle | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | I do not believe that the rail line as proposed makes fiscal sense. |
| Mr | Peter | Hinkle | | · | Chapel hill | Nc | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | Bs3z |
| N/G | Mike and Denise | Hoffman | | <u> </u> | Chapel Hill | North Card | | 27517 | 28-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Michael | Hoglund | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27507 | 23-Jun-15 | I support the petition to reject the proposed Durham-Orange Light rail project. |
| N/G | Lucinda | Hohn | | · <u> </u> | Chapel Hill | N/G | USA | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Thomas | Hohn | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 11-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Donald | Holloway | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 9-Oct-15 | We do not need it, it is too extremely expensive, will confiscate properties of others. |
| Ms. | Elaine | Holmes | | ' | Chapel Hill | N/G | USA | 27517 | 3-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Dennis | House | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Elizabeth | House | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 28517 | 7-Jul-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|------------|----------------|--------------------|-------|---------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|----------------|----------------------|---|
| Ms | Grace Meyer | Howell | | | CH, Durham County | North Card | USA | 27517 | 12-Oct-15 | The light rail is far too expensive based upon the per user cost of the likely users of this rail. The rail system will block both entrances to our neighborhood, making it almost impossible for us to enter and exit our neighborhood 18 hours per day. The rail project should be cancelled entirely and the funds diverted to far more pressing issues in education, health care and job development. |
| Dr. | Ping-Chuan | Hu | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 15-Jun-15 | It is none sense to put a railroad in front of a well- established niborhood. While the other side of the highway was empty. Don't do it. |
| N/G | Burk and Mary | Huey | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 6-Oct-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Dale | Huff | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | We do not support the proposed Light Rail plan. It needs an independent review by qualified experts to assure better options are found. Both traffic and noise issues created by the plan are unacceptable. |
| N/G | Andrea | Huffman | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Laura | Hulett | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Charles | Humble | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 28-Jun-15 | After living in urban centers with rapid transit, my initial position was in favor of Light Rail. However, we are not Boston and our many communities in the Triangle have not evolved along the proposed transit lines. Stop the studies and direct our efforts to better and more buses. |
| N/G | Robert | Humphreys | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | Many of the assumptions and justifications for use of the Durham-orange Light Rail seem erroneous and not realistic. |
| N/G | Stephanie | Humphreys | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | Many of the assumptions and justifications for use of the Durham-orange Light Rail seem erroneous and unrealistic. |
| N/G | Makiko | Humphreys | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | Many of the assumptions and justifications for use of the Durham-orange Light Rail seem erroneous and unrealistic. |
| Mr | Craig | Hyatt | | - | Chapel Hill | North Caro | | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Marija | Ivanovic | | = | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 25-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Susan | Jackson | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Matthew | Jackson | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G N/G | Paul Reitha | Jackson Jackson | | _ | Chapel Hill Chapel Hill | N/G N/G | N/G N/G | 27517 27517 | 8-Jun-15 8-Jun-15 | N/G Unbelievable that you would even consider doing |
| | | Jackson | | | | North Caro | | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | this project. Traffic, parking and a station that doesn't even serve our community. Please stop this project now! |
| Mr. | Sonny | JacksUll | | | Chapel Hill | inorui Caro | JUSA | 2/31/ | 2-3u11-13 | Money can be spent in better ways especially in a tight economy. We do NOT need the entrance to our development messed up or blocked in anyway and do not need added traffic problems. There are enough traffic issues already. |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|----------|-----------|----------|-------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| Dr. | Rachida | Jackson | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | This project is very expensive, and it is not going to help us. It is going to make our life miserable and create more traffic and stress. If many people are against it, then you need to find a solution to this huge problem! |
| N/G | Jane | Jannelli | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 9-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Valarie | jarvls | | | Durham | nc | USA | 27703 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Immanuel | Jarvis | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27703 | 30-Sep-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Larry | Jenkins | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Pamela | Jenkins | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | The proposed route of the light rail makes no sense and does not meet the intention of the rail. An independent auditor needs to review the plan to make recommendations on how to get this plan back on the correct path. |
| Mrs | Julie | Johnson | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | Please do not allow the light rail project to go through. The communities it will impact are full of children and families in an area that was never designed to support such a project. While meadowmont was the obvious choice (and was created to be such a center) now that it is off the table please do not go ahead with plan B. Please stand up for those who do not have the bullying power that meadowmont has used. Please do not allow this! |
| Mr | Timothy | Johnson | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | There are significant safety concerns with the Downing Creek and Little John crossings and nearby station in the proposed plan. Not to mention the questionable rationale given a station within walking distance at the Friday Center (with significantly more parking area too) and that Meadowmont was designed to have light rail run through it. |
| N/G | Nancy | Johnson | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 25-Jun-15 | If this project included the entire triangle area it might be worthy of consideration but as it does not, it does not. |
| N/G | James | Johnson | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Leslie | Johnson | | | Durham | NC | N/G | 27707 | 30-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Mark | Johnson | | | Durham | N/G | N/G | 27712 | 30-Sep-15 | The economic "case" for this project proposal is less than weak, but the cost is enormous. This is at best a complete boondoggle. |
| Dr | amy | jones | | | chapel hill | N/G | USA | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Bishop | Jordan | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | It is a waste of money that is not supported by the facts. |
| Ms. | Spencia | Joyner | | • | Durham | North Card | USA | 27704 | 5-Sep-15 | N/G |
| Professo | r Joseph | Kalo | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 8-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | David | Kao | | | Chapel Hill | NORTH CA | USA | 27517 | 9-Jul-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-----------|------------------|------------|-------|--------------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| Mr | Laurence | Katz | | | Chapel Hill | North Caro | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | The current transit system is underutilized and there is no reliable evidence that the light rail will be better utilized. There is evidence that the light rail will be an environmental and economic disaster and needs to be stopped. The federal government should not waste money on this project. |
| N/G | Laura | Kelly | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | Agree that the Farrington corridor is not the appropriate location for a train track much less a train maintenance depot. Regardless of the historic home sites, which would be a shame to lose, the area just is not large enough to accommodate such an undertaking. Using 15-501 makes much more sense, and trains could run right down the middle of the boulevard without much change in the landscape. |
| N/G | Everett | Kemp | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Sep-15 | This project wastes hard earned resources of residents to build an unusable system destroying natural areas and creating problems for residents. The only benefit of the project is to allow some uninformed government officials the opportunity to grandstand about their accomplishment. |
| N/G | james | kernodle | | | durham | nc orange | N/G | 27705 | 9-Sep-15 | You can count the train passengers nowon one hand. Not enuff people ride nowits a waste of our money.STOP THE TRAINand waste of OUR money! |
| Mr.and Mr | Graham and Susan | King | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | Our townhouse is right after the entrance to Downing Creek. Going in and out will be a constant issue. A real estate friend has told us our property value will drop even with this possibility. |
| Mr | EDWARD | KINNAIRD | | | CHAPEL HILL | NC | USA | 27517 | 23-Sep-15 | I do not support the light rail proposal (DOLRT). The municipalities simply do not have the financial resources to support this project. While transportation is an important issue for our area, I believe this solution will lead to more traffic congestion, a more dangerous community, a significant debt burden, and will be a blight on a beautiful community that took many years to build. I stand firmly behind the NO BUILD option |
| N/G | Jane | Kirsch | | [| Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | Please stop spending good money on a bad idea. |
| N/G | Jane | Kirsch | | ! | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 28-Jun-15 | N/G |
| | Mary Ann | Klompmaker | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Jay | Klompmaker | | 1 | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | I believe this project is both unfeasible and unnecessary. |

| Mor | Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|--|-------|-----------|-----------|-------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------|---------|-----------|---|
| Miles Man Koerber Chapel Hill Ourhann of USA 22512 Solut-15 Just the noise levels are emough to show that this is a declaration for this industrial facility Miles | | | | | | | | | - ' ' | | |
| Nic Milliam Generic Chapel Hill Nic Nic 27517 2-Aug-15 Nic | N/G | Ann | Koerber | | | · | Durham co | USA | 27517 | 30-Jul-15 | · · |
| Mosco | • | | | | | | | | | | a bad location for this industrial facility |
| Marcon M | N/G | William | koerber | | • | chapel hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 2-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 24 Jun-15 N/G N/G 27514 33 Jun-15 N/G N/G N/G N/G 27514 33 Jun-15 N/G N/ | N/G | Joseph | Koontz | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | _ | |
| Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27514 13-Jun-15 The current plan for the Durham-Chapel Hill Light Rail Project does not go where anyone except a limited few medical personnel want to go. Raleigh planners already fleured this current plan for the Durham-Chapel Hill Light Rail Project does not go where anyone except a limited few medical personnel want to go. Raleigh planners already fleured this current reads to go to RDU airport and on to Raleigh downtown. N/G Fred Lampe Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27514 22-Jun-15 N/G | Miss | Aynalem | Kumela | | | Bury | GraterMar | UK | BL9 9HD | 23-Sep-15 | N/G |
| Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27514 13-Jun-15 The current plan for the Durham-Chapel Hill Light Rail Project does not go where anyone except a limited few medical personnel want to go. Raleigh planners already fleured this current plan for the Durham-Chapel Hill Light Rail Project does not go where anyone except a limited few medical personnel want to go. Raleigh planners already fleured this current reads to go to RDU airport and on to Raleigh downtown. N/G Fred Lampe Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27514 22-Jun-15 N/G | N/G | Kathryn | Ladd | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Imited few medical personned want to go. Raleigh planners already figured this cut. To be useful to the general population, the route needs to go to RDU airport and on to Raleigh downtown. | N/G | Fred | Lampe | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27514 | 13-Jun-15 | The current plan for the Durham-Chapel Hill Light |
| Parenter already figured this out. To be useful to the general population, the route needs to go to RDU airport and on to Raleigh downtown. | | | | | | | | | | | Rail Project does not go where anyone except a |
| To be useful to the general population, the route needs to go to RDU airport and on to Raleigh downtown. N/G Fred Lampe Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27514 27-Jun-15 N/G Chapel Hill N/G USA 27514 8-Jun-15 N/G N/G Chapel Hill N/G USA 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G N/G Chapel Hill N/G USA 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G N/G Chapel Hill N/G Chapel Hill N/G USA 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G N/G N/G Chapel Hill N | | | | | | | | | | | limited few medical personnel want to go. Raleigh |
| N/G Fred Lampe Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27514 27-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | planners already figured this out. |
| N/G Fred Lampe Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27514 27-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | To be useful to the general population, the route |
| N/G Sara Larson Chapel Hill N/C USA 27517 12-Oct-15 1agree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade from drown and safety issues, especially at grade froad crossings and placement of the ROME in a residential community, and and equately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham of the Good of the ROME in a residential community, and and equately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham of the Good of the ROME in a residential community, and and equately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham of the Good of the ROME in a residential community, and adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham of the Good of the ROME in a residential community, and adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham of the Good of the ROME in a residential community, and adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham of the Good of the ROME in a residential community, and adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham of the Good of the ROME in a residential community, and calculate their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and modely schools to assure our unleased schools good continue forward with this light rail project. Durham of the Good of the ROME in a residential community, and calculate their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and modely schools to assure our unleased schools good continue forward with this light rail project. Durham of the Good of the ROME in a residential continue and adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham of the Good of the ROME in a residential continue and modely addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham of the Good of the ROME in a residential continue and modely addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham of the Good of the ROME in a residential continue and mode | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N/G | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dr | | | | | | | | | | | downtown. |
| Dr | N/G | Fred | Lampe | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27514 | 27-Jun-15 | N/G |
| M/S Crystal Lara Durham NC N/G 27707 19-Aug-15 N/G | Dr | Lilly | | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27514 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Durham North Card USA 27707 27-Aug-15 N/G | Mr | David | Lapp | | | Chapel Hill | NORTH CA | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7,7jul-15 | N/G | Dana | Lapple | | r | Durham | NC | N/G | 27707 | 19-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Mr Kenneth Larsen Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 10-Jun-15 Light Rail is a complete waste of money. It's too inflexible and will only benefit people who live within a quarter mile of a station and whose destination is also within a quarter mile of a station. If you do the math, that's a very small number of people. N/G Sara Larson Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 6-Jul-15 This project should not happen at all. The amount it will be used will not compensate for the amount it will be used will not compensate for the amount it will be used will not compensate for the congestion/disruption to everyday life it will cause to those who live close to the proposed route. Dr Sylvia Leaver Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 12-Oct-15 I agree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and molidy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 2-Jul-15 N/G Ms Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit the Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | Mrs. | Crystal | Lara | | | Durham | North Card | USA | 27707 | 27-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Inflexible and will only benefit people who live within a quarter mile of a station of alwhose destination is also within a quarter mile of a station if you do the math, that's a very small number of people. N/G Sara Larson Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 6-Jul-15 This project should not happen at all. The amount it will be used will not compensate for the amount it will couse to build or to compensate for the amount it will couse to build or to compensate for the congestion/disruption to everyday life it will cause to those who live close to the proposed route. Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 12-Oct-15 lagree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 8-Jul-15 N/G Ms Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit them. Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | Mr. | James | Larkin | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 10-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Inflexible and will only benefit people who live within a quarter mile of a station and whose destination is also within a quarter mile of a station. If you do the math, that's a very small number of people. N/G Sara Larson Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 6-Jul-15 This project should not happen at all. The amount it will be used will not compensate for the amount it will cost to build or to compensate for the amount it will cost to build or to compensate for the amount it will cost to build or to compensate for the congestion/disruption to everyday life it will cause to those who live close to the proposed route. Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 12-Oct-15 lagree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 2-Jul-15 N/G MS Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 3-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jul-15 N/G | Mr | Kenneth | Larsen | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | Light Rail is a complete waste of money. It's too |
| Dr Sylvia Leaver Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 12-Oct-15 Lagret that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill North Caro N/G 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit N/G N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit N/G N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 N/G N/ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N/G Sara Larson Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 6-Jul-15 This project should not happen at all. The amount it will be used will not compensate for the amount it will be used will not compensate for the amount it will cost to build or to compensate for the congestion/disruption to everyday life it will cause to those who live close to the proposed route. Dr Sylvia Leaver Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 12-Oct-15 I agree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill Nc USA 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G Ms Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Chapel Hill Nc Nc N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | within a quarter mile of a station and whose |
| N/G Sara Larson Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 6-Jul-15 This project should not happen at all. The amount it will be used will not compensate for the amount it will cost to build or to compensate for the congestion/disruption to everyday life it will cause to those who live close to the proposed route. Dr Sylvia Leaver Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 12-Oct-15 I agree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Chapel Hill NC N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | destination is also within a quarter mile of a station. |
| N/G Sara Larson Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 6-Jul-15 This project should not happen at all. The amount it will be used will not compensate for the amount it will be used will not compensate for the amount it will cost to build or to compensate for the congestion/disruption to everyday life it will cause to those who live close to the proposed route. Dr Sylvia Leaver Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 12-Oct-15 I agree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G Ms Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Ms Bernice Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | If you do the math, that's a very small number of |
| will be used will not compensate for the amount it will cost to build or to compensate for the congestion/disruption to everyday life it will cause to those who live close to the proposed route. Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 12-Oct-15 lagree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durnam City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G Ms Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Ms Bernice Leitner Chapel Hill NC N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | people. |
| Dr Sylvia Leaver Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 12-Oct-15 Lagree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill North Caro N/G 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G | N/G | Sara | Larson | | • | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | This project should not happen at all. The amount it |
| Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 12-Oct-15 lagree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill North Caro N/G 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G Ms Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Ms Bernice Leitner Chapel Hill NC N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | will be used will not compensate for the amount it |
| Dr Sylvia Leaver Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 12-Oct-15 I agree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill Nc USA 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G MS Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill Nc USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill Nc USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Chapel Hill Nc N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mg. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | will cost to build or to compensate for the |
| Dr Sylvia Leaver Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 12-Oct-15 I agree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill North Caro N/G 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G Ms Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Ms Bernice Leitner Chapel Hill Nc N/G N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | congestion/disruption to everyday life it will cause |
| grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill North Caro N/G 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G MS Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value MS Bernice Leitner Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | to those who live close to the proposed route. |
| grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill North Caro N/G 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G MS Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value MS Bernice Leitner Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Mr. Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill North Caro N/G 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Chapel Hill NC N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | Dr | Sylvia | Leaver | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 12-Oct-15 | I agree that cost and safety issues, especially at |
| Ar. Steve LeGardeur Mr. Steve Legert Mr. Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Ms Bernice Leitner Mr. Robert Leopold Addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Chapel Hill North Caro N/G 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Chapel Hill Nc N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold | | | | | | | | | | | - ' |
| project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. Steve LeGardeur Ms Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Chapel Hill NC N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Steve LeGardeur Mr. Steve Leggett Chapel Hill North Caro N/G 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Ms Bernice Leitner Mr. Robert Leopold Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Steve LeGardeur Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold | | | | | | | | | | | addressed to continue forward with this light rail |
| Mr. Steve LeGardeur Ms Peggy Leggett Mt Frederick Leitner Ms Bernice Leitner Ms Bernice Leitner Mr. Robert Leopold Maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. Mr. North Caro N/G 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G N/G USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Steve LeGardeur Ms Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Ms Bernice Leitner Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G Legardeur Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Chapel Hill NC N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Nr. Robert Leopold | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Steve LeGardeur Ms Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill North Caro N/G 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Chapel Hill NC N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Legartura Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Nr. N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| Mr. Steve LeGardeur Ms Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill North Caro N/G 27517 26-Jun-15 N/G Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Chapel Hill NC N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ms Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Ms Bernice Leitner Chapel Hill NC N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | | | | | | learning environment. |
| Ms Peggy Leggett Chapel Hill NC USA 27514 8-Aug-15 N/G Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Ms Bernice Leitner Chapel Hill NC N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | Mr. | Steve | LeGardeur | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | N/G | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mt Frederick Leitner Chapel Hill NC USA 27517 7-Jul-15 Cost too large for too little positive value Ms Bernice Leitner Chapel Hill Nc N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | 7 | | | | - | | | |
| Ms Bernice Leitner Chapel Hill Nc N/G 27517 7-Jul-15 Too much money for unclear and disruptive Benefit Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | 1 - | | | | | | | , |
| Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | 7 | | | | | | | |
| Mr. Robert Leopold Chapel Hill N/G N/G 27517 8-Jun-15 N/G | | | | | | , | | ' | | | · · |
| | Mr. | Robert | Leopold | | • | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | |
| | Mrs | Ingeborg | Leopold | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|----------------|---------|-------|----------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| N/G | John | Lewis | | | Durahm | NC | USA | 27707 | 23-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Ms. | Melanie | Leyden | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 28-Jul-15 | This is residential, suburban area consisting of a quiet country setting, three local schools, and serene neighborhoods. It is not the place for a 24 hour maintenance facility. It is absolutely unfair to the property owners in this area to rezone and create this facility. People invested in this neighborhood because of its county setting. Disrupting existing neighborhoods is unjust when there are better location available that are already zoned for industrial endeavors; Corwallis! |
| N/G | joseph & janet | liegl | | | chapel hill | Durham N | USA | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | Ridership seems unlikely to warrant the cost, given proposed route, and will cause great disturbance to existing neighborhoods and home values. |
| Dr | Jason | Liss | | | Chapel hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Henry | Lister | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | Please reject route C2 and C2A in favor of the route through Meadowmont, for which that development was originally approved. |
| N/G | K | Liu | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 25-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Qi | Liu | | | Chapel hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 13-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Brodie | Lloyd | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms. | Ann | Loftin | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27516 | 14-Sep-15 | What might make more sense, in my view, is a trolley along the middle of 15/501, all the way from Durham to Chapel Hill. It could go up Franklin, which would benefit from becoming a two-lane street again. Or along 54 and up to the hospital. Or both. And we need public transportation from Chapel Hill and Durham to the airport, whether bus or rail. |
| Mr. | Johnny | Long | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 29-Jul-15 | I strongly reject the current proposed Durham- Orange Light Rail project and pursue more cost effective alternatives that will meet the long term needs of the region. This route will be detrimental to the value and quality of living for homes and residents of Falconbridge/Huntingbridge, Downing Creek, Homes along Barbee Chapel Road, Chapelwood, and other areas along N.C. 54 East between Chapel Hill and Interstate 40. |
| Mrs | Joan | Long | | <u> </u> | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27516 | 26-Sep-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Martin | Lopez | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | This project is totally unnecessary. The majority of taxpayers affected do not want it. Put it to a vote. |
| N/G | Carter | Love | | · | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 9-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Michael David | Loven | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 12-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | James | Lowe | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 25-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Carmen | Lowe | | | chapel hill | North Card | | 27517 | 26-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Louchie | Lu | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|---------------------------------------|------------|---------------|---------|-------------|-----------|--------|--------|-------------|--|
| N/G | Aaron | Lubeck | | • | Durham | N/G | N/G | 27701 | 19-Aug-15 | N/G |
| MR | Clark | Luikart | | | Chapel Hill | North Ca | ro USA | 27517 | 23-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Jean | Lusted | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 12-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mx | Bob | Lynch | | | Durham | N/G | N/G | 27703 | 9-Jun-15 | LR would be ok, but Rapid Bus Transit, (RBT) is |
| | | | | | | | | | | much, much better. Also 1/2 the cost. |
| N/G | Lianne | MacGregor | | · | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Ridwan | Mahbub | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27514 | 21-Aug-15 | We don't need this train system. There is already a |
| | | | | | | | | | | free Chapel Hill wide public transportation system |
| | | | | | | | | | | and a triangle-wide bus system that does an |
| | | | | | | | | | | effective job of taking away residents. This costly |
| | | | | | | | | | | train serves no real purpose and may have |
| | | | | | | | | | | unintended consequences like bringing in crime, |
| | | | | | | | | | | noise, quality of life, etc. It is unlikely the train will |
| | | | | | | | | | | go everywhere we want it to. |
| Mr | Josh | Manchester | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Oct-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Michael | Mangili | _ | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 23-Aug-15 | I believe the project is not servicing enough of the |
| , 0 | i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i | | | 1 | onaper | 1.0 | 1., 0 | 2,31, | 25 7 (0) 25 | Triangle. I was in favor with Wake Co. involved but |
| | | | | | | | | | | the latest plan is bad. Location of the ROMF is in a |
| | | | | | | | | | | residential area and located to closely to an |
| | | | | | | | | | | elementary school. It is going to lead to more |
| | | | | | | | | | | headaches! |
| Dr | Arun | Manikumar | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 30-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms. | Kristi | Mann | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Kelly | Mansfield | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Raquel | Maradiaga | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Luis | Maradiaga | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 23-Jun-15 | The Durham-Orange Light Rail Train is unnecessary |
| | | | | | | | | | | and will be underused. We already have a working |
| | | | | | | | | | | bus system for public transportation. |
| N/G | Bonita | Marks | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | This is a poorly conceived idea and the needs |
| ' | | | | | ' | | | | | assessment report is fraudulent. There are too many |
| | | | | | | | | | | safety, economic and environmental issues to |
| | | | | | | | | | | approve the LRT project in this region. |
| N/G | Maria | Marquis | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 28-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | M | Mars | - | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | mary | mars | | | chapel hill | nc | N/G | 27517 | 6-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Mr | James | Mars | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Aug-15 | N/G |
| mr | wayne | marshall | | | raleigh | nc | N/G | 27609 | 16-Jun-15 | Stop it now! |
| N/G | lesley | marson | | | chapel hill | durham | N/G | 27517 | 29-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Caroline | Mason | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 21-Jul-15 | Do NOT want to see the access to 54/Little John |
| | | | | | | | | | | Road CLOSED! Too many people use it. |
| Ms | Laurin | Massengale | | 1 | Chapel Hill | North Ca | ro USA | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | If a light rail is put in I believe the Meadowmont |
| | | | | | | | | | | location will get better ridership and interfere with |
| | | | | | | | | | | traffic less than the C2A route. |
| N/G | Shelley | Masters | | | Chapel Hill | NC - Nort | th USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Marianna | Matinyan | | | Chapel Hill | Durham | USA | 27517 | 23-Jun-15 | I find the project utterly unnecessary . |
| N/G | Pamela | Mayer | | • | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| N/G | Philip | Mayer | | ı | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | No thank you! Please do not put the stop here |
| N/G | david | mayer | | | chapel hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 27-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Rebecca | Mayew | | • | Chapel hill | Nc | N/G | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Kathleen | McAndrews | | | Chapel Hill | nc | N/G | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | We do not need a 17 mile bridge to no where. It doesn't even go to RTP, the airport or Raleigh. It cost billions of dollars with not much value. Raleigh gave up on this idea because it made no sense. We should do so as well. Please cancel this. |
| Ms | Renee | McBride | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27712 | 24-Jun-15 | RDU, RTP and Southpoint should be served, and it should extend farther east and north in Durham to serve members of those communities (of which I am one). Serving Carrboro and Hillsborough should also be considered. |
| N/G | Julie | McBrierty | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Mike | McBrierty | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | S. G. | McCain | | • | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27516 | 8-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Debbie | McCarthy | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | D. C. | McCarthy | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | This is an ill-conceived plan. It will aid to the destruction of a rural buffer between Durham and Chapel Hill and is not in keeping with any plans. As usual the construction, long term water and air pollution, and the noise impacts will be on the citizens of Durham Co. thus maintaining the character of Chapel Hill. The water runoff from this facility and the noise and the ugliness are not something Durham residents want. |
| Mrs. | Kathy | McCord | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 1-Aug-15 | This is a total waste of resources because it will not benefit the people who need transportation. |
| N/G | Timothy | McCord | | | Durham | North Card | USA | 27705 | 9-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Diane | McElroy | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Diane | McGrath | | | Chapel Hill | Durham Co | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | This plan will create significant problems as well as very significant unintended consequences. For example the station for Woodmont has no parking spaces and the projected numbers for use are fantasy not fact. |
| Ms | Chris | McHugh | | ! | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 28-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Philip | McHugh | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 29-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Scott | McIlhenny | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------|---------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------------------|---|
| N/G | Ingrid | McIntosh | | | CHAPEL HILL | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 21-Jun-15 | The Farrington Road proposed location for the Maintenance Facility will destroy our 55 plus community. The creation of an industrial area in our rural, quiet community will significantly lower our property values, increase local crime and threaten the financial andn physical security of our senior citizens in this area. |
| N/G | James | McIntosh | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | Location of maintenance facility near school & our 55 plus community and other residential areas. |
| Mrs | Kathleen | McManus | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 27-Aug-15 | Because of the already existing traffic congestion along this route, adding more stops will only increase the problems. Additionally, light rail has not proven to benefit municipalities and consumer satisfaction. |
| N/G | Hannah | Meador | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | Properties on Meadowmont Lane (and in the rest of the neighborhood) were all purchased with the full disclosure of future light rail plans in place going through that location. My parents considered this fact 13 years ago when building a house in Meadowmont. The basis for altering these plans seems nonsensical, biased, and not in keeping with Chapel Hill's reputation for thoughtful long-term planning in the interest of the community as a whole. |
| N/G | Judith | Mellyn | | | Chapel Hill | North Car | o N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | The process leading up to the selection of light rail and its preferred route alignments undervalued, or in many instances ignored, the needs and concerns of Orange/Durham residents. Unless and until we, the citizens of Orange and Durham, receive equitable services, expert opinion validating the applicability of light rail to our specific population distributions, and full disclosure of the cost and ridership methodologies used to justify Go-Triangle / MPO request for funding from the FTA, it is unconscionable to even consider expending our limited tax dollars on this flawed proposal. |
| NArc | Marsis | Morask | | | Durch area | NC | LICA | 27707 | 10 km 15 | N/G |
| Mrs N/G | Marcia Roger | Mensah Messier | | _ | Durham Chapel hill | North Car | USA O N/G | 27707 28480 | 19-Jun-15 22-Jun-15 | There are better ways to spend text dollars. Z |
| N/G N/G | Caroline | Mikaloff | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC NOrth Car | USA | 27517 | 18-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Ms | June | Milby | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| 1412 | Julic | IVIIIDY | | | Chaperfill | INC | UJA | 2/31/ | 2-Juli-13 | 14/0 |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|------------|---------------|-------------|-------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------------------|--|
| Mr. | Norbert | Mildner | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | This is a absolute Waste of taxpayer's money. The cost per ridership does not add up. Line of travel is very insufficient, does not go to airport, big mall's, stadium. Charlotte, which is 3 x as big as chapel hill does not cover the cost yet, means taxpayer still has to support the project. By the time the LR is built the technology is outdated. There are better alternatives to meat the proposed demand for the CH area. The maintenance , upkeep safety issue are Oslo a big concern. |
| mr | Norbertt | Mildner | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | USA | 27517 | 15-Sep-15 | |
| mr. Mrs | Theresa | Miles | | | Chapel Hill | North Car | | 27517 | 15-5ep-15 8-Jun-15 | I do not think the light rail is a good idea for several reason. I rode the light rail in Baltimore for five years (starting with first year). I would be surprised if this saves money and created jobs. I only saw the crime on the light rail and the communities it brought crime to. I also do not think any light rail is truly making money or saving money. I also do not see why Meadowmont can say no they do not want it after the decision was made to have it. I feel that you are just putting across the street because we do not have the money to fight it and the Finley Forest community will only be hurt more, with the home values decreasing. I am not against the idea of going green, but I do see where the benefits out way the means on this one. |
| N/G | Christopher | Miles | | | Baltimore | Maryland | LICA | 410 | 25-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Jeff | Miller | | | Chapel Hill | North Car | | 27517 | 9-Sep-15 | This project is a Loser! STOP IT !!! |
| Ms | Esther | Miller | | | Chapel Hill | North Car | | 27517 | 9-Sep-15 | This project is a Loser! STOP IT !!! |
| N/G | gerry & adele | mittelstadt | | | chapel hill | nc durhan | | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | We are living in a 55 and older community across from the proposed repair and maintenance facility. we are against this construction being built and totally against the light rail train. |
| Mrs | Mary | Moeller | | | Chapel Hill | Durham | USA | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | Too close to my children's school and my neighborhood which is going to cause significant increase in traffic as well as strande people meandering in close proximity to over 900 elementary children!! |
| Mr | Andrew | Moeller | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 27-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Jason | Moon | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Tara | Moon | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Reginald | Moore | | _ | Hickory | NC | USA | 28601 | 11-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mrs | Debbie | Moore | | _ | DURHAM | NC - North | | 27707 | 25-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Sandra | Morgan | | | CHAPEL HILL | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|------------|-----------|-------|--------------|-------------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| Dr | William | Morley | | <u> </u> | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Lauren | Morris | | - | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Sep-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Craig | Morris | | | Chapel hill | N/G | N/G | 27514 | 14-Sep-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Betty | Morris | | | Chapel Hill | Durham | N/G | 27517 | 12-Oct-15 | Please do not start a light rail system just for UNC, DUKE, NCC! A rail system is needed for Raleigh Chapel Hill Durham where I 40 is packed, not just the universities! Also, look at the fiasco of Charlotte rail system! It's an embarrassment!!!! Do we want the same for Furham and Chapel Hill? NO LIGHT RAIL!!! NO REZONING!!! |
| N/G | Bonnie | Morrison | | 1 | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Ellen | Moul | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 30-Sep-15 | very expensive project with minimal value to residents. Money can be spent more effectively without disrupting our lovely neighborhoods. |
| N/G | Nell | Mowry | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27705 | 7-Sep-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Felicisimo | Munda | | - | Durham | N/G | N/G | 27707 | 23-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Ms | felicia | mundy | | | chapel hill | North Ca | ro USA | 27517 | 29-Jul-15 | While I favor light rail in general, I don't believe this project and its current route will alleviate traffic problems. I think this is a huge waste of tax payer money. |
| Dr | William | mundy | | ' | chapel hill | North Ca | ro USA | 27517 | 29-Jul-15 | Route will not solve traffic problems. |
| Ms | felicia | mundy | | | chapel hill | North Car | ro USA | 27517 | 26-Aug-15 | This is not a good use of taxpayer money and the existing plan will not solve our current traffic issues. |
| N/G | Joyce | munkacsi | | | chapel hill | nc | N/G | 27517 | 7-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr | James | Munkacsi | | | Chapel Hill | North aC | ar USA | 27517 | 8-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mrs | Beth | Myers | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 26-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Darlene | Naugle | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Dennis | Naugle | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms. | Dao | Ngo | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 13-Sep-15 | We don't really need it. Train takes longer where we want to go. Cost a lot to build it. Waste time and money for it. |
| Mrs | Chi | Nguyen | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 11-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Michael | Nguyen | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 11-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Robert | Nickerson | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27516 | 2-Oct-15 | This is a boondoggle of major proportion. If completed everyone 30 years from now will look back and say "WHAT WERE THEY THINKING." |
| Mrs | Hadley | Nixon | | • | Chapel Hill | North Ca | ro USA | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Candace | Noel | | | Durham | North Ca | ro USA | 27707 | 20-Aug-15 | Noise, disrupted traffic at at-grade crossings, home values negatively affected, horribly expensive given the limited businesses that can be accessed along the route. |
| N/G | Brian | Norris | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 15-Sep-15 | I would like to see much more investigation into the possibilities of BRT for this corridor! |
| Mr. | Blaise | Noto | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-------|----------|-------------|----------|---------|--------|-----------|---|
| Mr. | Blaise | Noto | | <u>.</u> | Chapel Hill | North Ca | ro USA | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | The costs of this project are astronomical and will |
| | | | | | | | | | | only escalate over time with the costs I once again |
| | | | | | | | | | | be assumed by the taxpayers. Focus on making the |
| | | | | | | | | | | roads better, wider, and more and better bus |
| | | | | | | | | | | transportation. |
| N/G | Robert | O'Connell | | • | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jul-15 | Why hurt so many to try to advantage so few? Why |
| | | | | | | | | | | not do the "non-hurt any" for the benefit of the |
| | | | | | | | | | | many both on and not one the trains. Let's do the |
| | | | | | | | | | | array of: buses, bus lanes, staggered work hours, car |
| | | | | | | | | | | pools, bike lanes, coordinated street lights, smart |
| | | | | | | | | | | streets and more and more. Thanks for listening. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Think deeply and wisely! |
| N/G | Peggy | O'Connell | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jul-15 | Why hurt so many to try to advantage so few? Why |
| l [*] | 007 | | | | , | | | | | not do the "non-hurt any" for the benefit of the |
| | | | | | | | | | | many both on and not one the trains. Let's do the |
| | | | | | | | | | | array of: buses, bus lanes, staggered work hours, car |
| | | | | | | | | | | pools, bike lanes, coordinated street lights, smart |
| | | | | | | | | | | streets and more and more. Thanks for listening. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Think deeply and wisely! |
| Ms. | Maureen | Oakes | | | Chapel Hill | Norfh Ca | ıro USA | 27517 | 25-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Ilana | Osten | | | | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | William | Ott | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 3-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mrs | Marissa | Outten | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27514 | 21-Jul-15 | Due to safety issues with cars and pedestrians this |
| | | | | | | | | | | project needs to be stopped. |
| N/G | karen | paden | | | chapel hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 30-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Susan | Palmer | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 5-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | John | Parker | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Patrick | Parks | | | Durham | North Ca | | 27707 | 17-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Kristi | Passaro | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | USA | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Paul | Passaro | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | USA | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Virginia | Pate | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | I am particularly concerned about the safety of |
| | | | | | | | | | | multiple grade level crossings around my |
| | | | | | | | | | | neighborhood but also question who will actually |
| | | | | | | | | | | benefit from this project. Traffic between South |
| | | | | | | | | | | Durham & UNC along Barbee Chapel Rd seems to be |
| | | | | | | | | | | one of the more highly traveled routes in this area, |
| | | | | | | | | | | perhaps second only to US-54 to I-40 from UNC to |
| | | | | | | | | | | RTP; the light rail will not serve either of those |
| | | | | | | | | | | communities and will actually cause increased |
| | | | | | | | | | | traffic delays due to street level crossing on the |
| | | | | | | | | | | south side of 54. |
| Dr | Scottie | Pate | | | chapel hill | nc | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | My objection is to ground level tracks in an already |
| | | | | | | | | | | congested high-traffic area |
| N/G | Frances | Patterson | | = | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Hal | Patterson | | - | Chapel Hill | nc | USA | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | N/G |
| mr | louis | payne | | | Chapel hill | North Ca | iro USA | 27517 | 27-Sep-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| Mrs | Susan | Pearl | | ' | | Durham | Nc | USA | 27713 | 2-Oct-15 | This money would be better served to be used for |
| | | | | | | | | | | | high occupancy lanes and better bus service |
| | | | | | | | | | | | 6 |
| Ms | Barbara | Pelet | | | | Chapel hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Sandy | Pendergraft | | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | I live near the intersection of Barbee Chapel and NC |
| | , | | | | | ' | | | | | HWY54. The traffic is already very bad during the |
| | | | | | | | | | | | rush hours. Sometimes it takes a while to just get |
| | | | | | | | | | | | out of my driveway. This rail system would make it |
| | | | | | | | | | | | unbearable. |
| mr. | Steve | Pendergraft | | • | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | LeeAnne | Pendergraft | | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 2-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | LuAnne | Pendergraft | | | | Chapel hill | N/G | USA | 27517 | 3-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Don | Pendergraft | | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Roger | Pendleton | | | | Chapel Hill | N.C. | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Lawrence | Perkins | | | | Chapel hill | Nc | USA | 27517 | 26-Aug-15 | I oppose the light rail project. It is expensive and |
| | | | | | | | | | | | since it won't go to the airport or the RTP, it won't |
| | | | | | | | | | | | be used. |
| N/G | mary | Pettiette | | • | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Mitch | Phillips | | 1 | d | West Jefferson | NC | USA | 28694 | 15-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs | Christine | Phillips | | | | Durham | N/G | USA | 27707 | 25-Jul-15 | Putting an industrial maintenance facility in an area |
| | | | | | | | | | | | that is full of homes, near an elementary school and |
| | | | | | | | | | | | where it will drive out local wildlife is not |
| | | | | | | | | | | | acceptable. There are several more reasons why this |
| | | | | | | | | | | | is not a good idea: traffic issues, value of real estate |
| | | | | | | | | | | | and increases in the taxes around this area to pay |
| | | | | | | | | | | | for the outrageous cost of building this. I am against |
| | | | | | | | | | | | this and it is not necessary between Durham and |
| | | | | | | | | | | | chapel hill. |
| | | | | | | | | | | | · |
| Mr. | Dustan | Phillips | | • | | Durham | North Car | o N/G | 27707 | 11-Sep-15 | N/G |
| N/G | susan | pierce | | | | chapel Hill | Durham | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | Maintenance facility at Farrington is a hazard both |
| | | | | | | | | | | | to the elementary school and an over 55 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | community. Toxic fumes are a special hazard for the |
| | | | | | | | | | | | young and the elderly. D3 |
| Dr. | Susan | Pierce | | | | Chapel Hill | Durham C | Co USA | 27517 | 28-Jun-15 | Grade-level crossings are NOT safe. |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | Farrington RAMF next to an elementary school and a |
| | | | | | | | | | | | community for elders is NOT safe pending the |
| | | | | | | | | | | | need to evacuate due to "accidents" from |
| | | | | | | | | | | | flammable liquids that will be used daily, 24 hours, 7 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | days/week not to mention that this area is zoned |
| | | | | | | | | | | | R-20, residential. |
| mr | William | Pitts | | | | Chapel Hill | North Car | o USA | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | There is not sufficient density to support light rail in |
| | | | | | | | | | | | this area at this time. Building a light rail system to |
| | | | | | | | | | | | encourage density is totally backwards. |
| Mrs | Amanda | Podgoreanu | | | | Chapel hill | Nc | USA | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Joel | Poe | | | | Liberty | N C | USA | 27298 | 12-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Patricia | Porter | | → | - | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Barbara | Post | | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 1-Oct-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-----------|-----------|----------|-------|----------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| N/G | Philp | Post | p | | Chapel Hill | Durham | N/G | 27517 | 2-Oct-15 | We need and can afford Bus Rapid Transit, which has the power to serve a much wider area of Orange and Durham Counties. We do Not need a fixed rail system and we cannot afford it and it will not be flexible enough to serve our citizens. |
| MS | Teresa | Priboth | | | Durham | North Card | USA | 27707 | 24-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Joe | Procopio | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 25-Jul-15 | Light rail is not feasible for a metro area as widely spread as ours. This is a train to nowhere. |
| Mrs. | Allison | Procopio | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 25-Jul-15 | Please do not spoil our quiet family communities when alternatives like 15-501 would be less intrusive and be accessible to so many more people. Plus, traffic on Farrington is already terrible in the morning and rush hour. |
| Mr. and M | Mark | Prokop | | <u> </u> | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 26-Aug-15 | Stop Durham-Orange Light Rail Train |
| Prof. | John | Pucher | | | Raleigh | NC | USA | 27615 | 18-Aug-15 | The planned LRT from Chapel Hill to Durham should be cancelled, as it would be a tragic waste of scarce tax dollars needed to fund improvements in bus services, including express service and Bus Rapid Transit throughout the Triangle Area. All studies show that express bus service and BRT are much more effective than LRT, which is an outdated technology. It would take 15 years to complete the D-O LRT, while improved bus service could start within a year or two. |
| Mrs | Pamela | Pulsfort | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | I believe that the light rail project as it is proposed if extremely ill conceived. I do not believe that there will be enough people riding it to off set the enormous expense and it will be very disruptive to traffic at the Downing Creek entrance and along Hwy. 54. Not to mention the already huge traffic tie ups during UNC events. It will be a huge disaster that we have to pay for with taxpayer funds and traffic congestion. Also, the state wants to widen Hwy 54 after light rail is in place. That will be a double disaster. Build it then move it??? Who is making these decisions? |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-----------|-----------|------------|-------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| N/G | J. | Pulsfort | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 15-Sep-15 | We personally know of at least 26 years of mass transit promotion via the multitude of adjustable |
| | | | | | | | | | | bussing routes by numerous federally & state |
| | | | | | | | | | | subsidized programs which to date, by your own |
| | | | | | | | | | | figures, have failed to carry more than some 1500 |
| | | | | | | | | | | riders, despite regional growth that exceeds |
| | | | | | | | | | | Charlotte's. Raleigh already rejected this faulty plan. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Quit trying to foist it upon us. The federal budget |
| | | | | | | | | | | can't afford it, neither can the state, we don't want |
| | | | | | | | | | | it & terrorist attacks in Spain, England & France |
| | | | | | | | | | | prove it's too dangerous for our children and families anyway. |
| | | | | | | | | | | Scrap this nonsense and accelerate the safer more |
| | | | | | | | | | | useful road widenings that are already planned for |
| | | | | | | | | | | UNC's needs, which arrive by roads, not expensively |
| | | | | | | | | | | limited light rail. |
| N/G | John | Quinterno | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27514 | 14-Sep-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | JERRY | RAWLINSON | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 10-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Mr | James | Ray | | ı | Durham | NC | USA | 27705 | 8-Oct-15 | There is no need to burden the tax payers with a |
| | | | | | | | | | | system that will not encompass the entire triangle |
| | | | | | | | | | | nor have any federal help. waste of money as usual |
| Mrs | Marcia | Rea | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 19-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Ervin | Rea | | _ | Chapel Hill | Durham | USA | 27517 | 19-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Ann | Recesso | | 1 | Chapel Hill | N.C. | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | Placing light rail across the entrance to Downing |
| | | | | | | | | | | Creek is dangerous and will cause unnecessary |
| | | | | | | | | | | traffic congestion. It seems this area cannot support light rail regardless as the population, no matter |
| | | | | | | | | | | how lawyers fiddle with the statistics, does not |
| | | | | | | | | | | warrant it. |
| N/G | Michael | Reed | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 27-Jun-15 | The current light rail commuter train plan will not |
| ' | | | | | | | | | | meet the transportation needs of our community. |
| | | | | | | | _ | _ | | |
| N/G Mr | Christine | Reed | | | Chapel Hill | NC NC | USA | 27517 | 29-Jun-15 | N/G |
| IVIT | Lucas | Reed | | I | Chapel Hill | INC | USA | 27517 | 22-Sep-15 | The current route does not reach those areas with |
| | | | | | | | | | | the greatest ridership needs. I prefer the no build option to the current plan. |
| N/G | Kelly | Reilly | | | Durham | North Card | USA | 27707 | 27-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Jeffrey | Reilly | | _ | Durham | NC NC | USA | 27707 | 27-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Ms. | Judith | Rhew | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Pamela | Rhodes | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Susan | Rice | | | Durham | NC | N/G | 27707 | 20-Aug-15 | Do NOT build the Light Rail Train!! |
| Mrs. | Stacey | Richardson | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 28-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Becky | Riggsbee | | | Carrboro | NC | USA | 27510 | 21-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Mr | John | Riordan | | I | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 12-Jun-15 | The Durham-Orange Light Rail plans seem quite incomplete and very poorly developed. |
| N/G | Rita | Robbins | | | Chapel Hill | Durham Co | N/G | 27517 | 9-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Henry | robbins | | | chapel hill | nc | USA | 27517 | 14-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Janet | roberson | | | chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Roderick | Roberson | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|----------------|------------|-------|---------|-------------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| N/G | Robyn Weaver | Robyn | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | I don't support nor do I believe the light rail system as proposed would be utilized as much as the proponents would like taxpayers to believe. This seems like a waste of my tax dollars especially given the monumental problems on the I-40 corridor between Chapel Hill and Raleigh, which the light rail will do nothing to help and will only leave a greater deficit of tax dollars to resolve the I-40 immediate and future problems. |
| Mrs. | Nora | Rohde | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 27-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Mallory | Roman | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 1-Aug-15 | The costs far outweigh the benefits of the light rail. Most people in the region already have transportation. A much less invasive transportation solution can be offered to those who don't by simply improving the bus system. Building and operating the light rail will disturb hundreds of homeowners and decrease property values for many of us who already live here. Stop the light rail! |
| Ms | Margaret q | Roos-Codsi | | | Chapel Hill | Durham | USA | 27517 | 25-Aug-15 | The safety of the road crossings concerns me. I also question the projected use/ridership figures, With non-flexible routes. BRT would have the ability to flex with the situations as they change in coming years.6bv |
| N/G | Eugene | Rossitch | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 5-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Steffi | Rubin | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 20-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Charles | Rushbrook | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Charles | Rushbrook | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Paula | Russell | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Dana | Saleeby | | 1 | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Sheila | Salter | _ | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 13-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | rhoda | samuels | | I | chapel hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 12-Jun-15 | Too expensive and too visually unappealing. Too dangerous and too inconvenient. |
| N/G | Ariel and Phil | Sandick | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 29-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Donna | sayers | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | The light rail was to go through Meadowmont and |
| | | | | | | | | | | as promised, it still should. |
| Mr | Christopher | Scallion | | | Durham | North Car | _ | 27707 | 24-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Ashley | Scallion | | | Durham | NC NC | USA | 27707 | 24-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Allison | Schmitt | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | Too much noise for a residential neighborhood and too much environmental impact. Traffic congestion would be unbearable |
| Mr | Christopher | Schmitt | | • | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | We strongly oppose this development. |
| mrs | vicki | scott | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | This proposal is very damaging to our community and not financially smart with the amount of usage that is expected. |
| N/G | Lauren | Scott | | | Chapel hill | Nc | USA | 27517 | 11-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Carl | Scott | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | I oppose this Lite Rail on Patterson Rd |
| Ms | Nancy | Scott | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | I oppose the Lite Rail on Patterson Rd5 |
| N/G | Stephanie | Scotti | | <u></u> | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 1-Jul-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|----------|-------|---------|--------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| Ms | E. Jane | Seeley | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 24-Jul-15 | While I, in general, support the light rail concept; |
| | | | | | | | | | | there are elements of the proposed plan that are so |
| | | | | | | | | | | egregious that I don't think the project should |
| | | | | | | | | | | proceed. At grade crossings are dangerous and |
| | | | | | | | | | | impede already burdened traffic; the proposed |
| | | | | | | | | | | maintenance station on Farrington Road is |
| | | | | | | | | | | unconscionable - being placed in a quiet residential |
| | | | | | | | | | | neighborhood and near a school. |
| Ms | Anita | Shanker | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 27-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | George | Sharpley | | _ | Raleigh | North Card | USA | 27609 | 8-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Michael | Shepard | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | N/G | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | I don't wish to have this rail system. This is a huge |
| | | | | | | | | | | impact to me and my lifestyle. |
| N/G | Rachel | Shepard | | • | Chapel hill | nc | N/G | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Ruth | Shrieve | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Julia | Simons | | | Durham | North Card | USA | 27707 | 3-Oct-15 | I observe most buses in our area, SW Durham, only |
| | | | | | | | | | | have a few passengers! We could use smaller buses |
| | | | | | | | | | | . I don't see the need |
| | | | | | | | | | | for light-rail in this area, at all!! |
| N/G | Richard | Sloane | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 19-Jul-15 | Although I'm a life-long fan and user of alternative |
| | | | | | | | | | | transportation (bikes, buses, and car-pools), I believe |
| | | | | | | | | | | this project does little if anything to alleviate current |
| | | | | | | | | | | congestion, and costs way to much. Get more |
| | | | | | | | | | | buses and add a stop in front of Downing Creek - so |
| | | | | | | | | | | much cheaper than this project. The widened |
| | | | | | | | | | | shoulder on Barbee Chapel has been a great |
| | | | | | | | | | | improvement for cyclists! |
| N/G | Teresa | smith | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Kelly | Smith | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Tim | Smith | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Josh | Smith | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27713 | 12-Jun-15 | I'm afraid the development of the land will decrease |
| | | | | | | | | | | property values in the Downing Creek and |
| | | | | | | | | | | Meadowmont area close to where I work and live. |
| N/G | Christine | Smith | | | Durham | Nc | USA | 27713 | 12-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Barbara | Smith | | | Chapel Hill | N.C. | USA | 27517 | 19-Jul-15 | The Light rail project will cost a lot of money and |
| | | | | | | | | | | benefit a few. We already have very good bus |
| | | | | | | | | | | service for people who desire to use mass transit. |
| N/G | Scott | Smith | | | Chapel Hill | Orange Co | USA | 27516 | 30-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Thomas | Smith | t | | Chapel Hill | North Card | | 27516 | 25-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | LuAnn | Smith | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27516 | 25-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Alan | Snavely | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27516 | 14-Sep-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Anna | Snavely | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 11-Oct-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Allison | Snyder | | | Hillsborough | NORTH CA | USA | 27278 | 1-Oct-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------|---------|-------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| Ms | Susan | Sonberg | | | Chapel Hill | NC NC | USA | 27517 | 23-Jun-15 | l am concerned with the safety of the rail project, especially the C2A route which will place 3 at grade crossings. This will exacerbate the significant traffic congestion that exists at the dangerous intersection of Barbee Chapel Rd/NC54 and obstruct the only points residents of Little John Rd and Downing Creek Pkwy have to access NC 54. Trains will run unsynchronized in each direction every ten minutes making it nearly impossible to get in and out of our neighborhood without risking our lives and that of children on school buses or bikes. The methodology and logic used to establish ridership estimates that favored C2A are flawed. They are based on a premise that a slight differential in overall time-dramatically changes the ridership projections of a given route. This is an illogical premise given there will ultimately be one route It will not deliver on promise of reducing congestion on NC54 as the route doesn't run to RTP, the airport or help with a commutes to anywhere but Duke or UNC. Taxpayers will bear the burden of costs and issues from this project for years to come. The promise of transit could be delivered more flexibility using a Bus Rapid Transit concept. |
| N/G | Shirley | Sopko | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 29-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs | Lisa | Spadafino | | | Durham | North Caro | | 27703 | 2-Oct-15 | I believe that a light rail will not be helpful to us in this region. It will not be cost effective, very disruptive while being constructed, and not utilized by Durham and Chapel Hill residents. All in all, it is a waste of tax payers money. |
| N/G | Linda | Spallone | | | Chapel hill | Durham co | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | With reluctance I have to oppose construction, it seems this project is way off course with the actual needs of the area. It has lost support of wake co participation and emphasizing a route between hospitals does not seem the best way to control traffic. They need to step back ,regroup and solicit is comments and input from all stakeholders, the seem to be bouncing from one alternative to another when ever they meet any kind of opposition I am also questioning the many at level crossings which further impede traffic flow |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|----------|--------------------|--------------|----------|----------|-------------------------|------------|------------|----------------|-----------------------|--|
| N/G | linda | spallone | | • | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Oct-15 | THe future Durham and Chapel Hill will be so angry |
| | | l · | | | | | | | | with you, Go Traiangle when they see you |
| | | | | | | | | | | destroyed a majot wetland area and you created all |
| | | | | | | | | | | this at grade crossings. The future will have no clean |
| | | | | | | | | | | water to drink and they will tear out your at grade |
| | | | | | | | | | | crossing and say how dumb was that Shame on |
| | | | | | | | | | | you |
| Mr | Gary | Spitz | | + | Chapel Hill | Durham | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | Very much OPPOSED to this initiative across from |
| | | | | | | | | | | our Culp Arbor community. |
| N/G | Julia | spring | | <u>'</u> | chapel Hill | nc | USA | 27527 | 3-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Bill | Stagg | | _ | Durham | NC | USA | 27705 | 25-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Elisabeth | Stagg | | _ | Durham | Durham | USA | 27705 | 25-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Ilene | Stewart | | | Chapel Hill | Durham Co | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Catherine | Stewart | | • | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Jim | Stikeleather | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27514 | 9-Jun-15 | Wait for Raleigh. Durham is easily assessable by car |
| | | | | | | | | | | without getting impacting I40 traffic. |
| N/G | Amanda | Strawbridge | | | chapel hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 1-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | George | Stuart | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 3-Jul-15 | N/G |
| mr | Gregory | Sulin | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | Meadowmount was designed and approved for light |
| | | | | | | | | | | rail please put it where it was meant to go. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mrs. | Cynthia | Sundy | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 14-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms. | Kristin | Sundy | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 14-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms. | Anna | Sundy | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 14-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Thomas | Swasey | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Judith | Swasey | | | Chapel Hill | Durham | USA | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Thomas | Swasey | | • | Chapel Hill | NC - North | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | Light rail as planned ignores the needs of the |
| | | | | | | | | | | neighborhoods and there are better, less expensive |
| | | | | | | | | | | alternatives like electric buses and protected bike |
| | | | | | | | | | | lanes |
| N/G | Dorothy | Sylvestre | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Cindy Lee | Talisman | | | Hillsborough | NC | USA | 27278 | 8-Oct-15 | There is no need to burden the tax payers with a |
| | | | | | | | | | | system that will not encompass the entire triangle |
| | | | | | | | | | | nor have any federal help. Yes the area is growing |
| | | | | | | | | | | BUT this area also like their cars and this will be an |
| | | | | | | | | | | needless expenditure for maybe a chosen few. We |
| | | | | | | | | | | are NOT NYC or DC that enjoy the rail system and no |
| | | | | | | | | | | matter how hard transplants come here and try to |
| | | | | | | | | | | change the area it won't work! |
| | <u>.</u> | | | | 1000 | | | 070-0 | | |
| Mrs | Iwona | Tauer | _ | | Hillsborough | Orange | USA | 27278 | 4-Oct-15 | N/G |
| Mr. | Ronald | Tell | | I | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | The grade crossings at Barbie Chapel Road and |
| | | | | | | | | | | Downing Creek Parkway will be unsafe for the |
| | | | | | | | | | | volume of traffic using both street. You must find a |
| Mrc | loan | Tell | | | Chanal Hill | NC | N/C | 27517 | 11 Jun 15 | better solution. |
| Mrs. | Jean W Goorgo | | \dashv | | Chapel Hill Chapel Hill | NC NC | N/G USA | 27517 27517 | 11-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr Ms | W George Alexis | Thomason | \dashv | | | NC NC | USA | 27517 | 13-Jul-15 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| 1012 | Alexis | Thompson | | I | Chapel Hill | INC | USA | 2/51/ | 0-Juli-12 | Please run the light rail throught the intended |
| | | | | | | | | | | development of Meadowmont that was built and |
| | | | | | | | | | | approved as a light rail development. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|-----------------|-------|---------|------------------|------------|--------|--------|-----------|--|
| Mr | PAUL | THOMPSON | | | Durham | North Caro | | 27707 | 22-Jul-15 | We do not need this expensive boondoggle! |
| N/G | Julie | Thurman | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 19-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Taylor | Thurman | 1 | - | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Anne | Tice | T | - | Durham | NC | USA | 27713 | 2-Oct-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Margie | Tippett | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 29-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Elaine | Tomberlin Lopez | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Ingrid | Toth | T = | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 3-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Sally | Trauco | | | 13 Littlejohn Rd | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | In support of the rail just not the location along Stancil where traffic is already horrendous! |
| Dr. | Dimitri | Trembath | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 26-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Dina | Trobbiani | | | Durham | NC | N/G | 27707 | 26-Jun-15 | At grade rail line crossing will seriously disrupt traffic flow and increase congestion along Farrington Rd, particularly throttling commute to/from 54/40/UNC/Raleigh; planned industrial zoned ROMF site will do same and devalue properties in Farrington Rd. dependent communities. |
| N/G | Gil | Turner | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 30-Jul-15 | The bottom line in all of this tax waste is that Chapel Hill and Durham will STILL NOT HAVE ADEQUATE TRANSPORTATION and their residents will be burdened with excessive tax and NO BENEFITS. |
| ms | Barbara | Ulam | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | I am against the proposed light rail system that will pass by the entrance to Downing Creek in Chapel Hill. It will effect property values and will be noisy and congested. |
| Dr | Jan | Ulrich | _ | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 14-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr | Beth | Ulrich | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 14-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Gaby | Valdivia | | | Durham | N/G | USA | 27707 | 25-Jul-15 | The light rail to connect chapel hill and Durham is a wasteful project with little ridership impact. There's not sufficient congestion, we don't have the population numbers for this project. It will be a burden on residents, it will increase traffic on the arteries it crossed, and is based on dubious and poor research. Stop. |
| N/G | Stef | van Dijk | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Connie | Vance | 1 | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 7-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Andrea | Vinson | 4 | 1 | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 6-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Delores | Vitali | | | Chapel Hill | N. C. | USA | 27517 | 26-Jun-15 | This Rail system is going to hinder the traffic that already exists. How and how many people are going to ride it?? Certainly not the elderly and crippled. What is going to happen on Farrington Road is a total disgrace. What are you people thinking of , besides putting money in your pockets! |
| Ms. | Ann | Von Holle | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | The light rail will be a danger and nuisance to Downing Creek, the community in which I live. |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-------|-----------|---------------|-------|--------------|---------------------|------------|--------|-----------|-----------|--|
| Mrs. | Jane | Wagstaff | | | Durham | North Caro | _ | 27707 | 1-Oct-15 | DOLRT is a fiscal explosion that will never ever |
| | | | | | | | | | | attract the projected ridership. |
| N/G | Shelley | Walter | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 17-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Janie B. | Ward | _ | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Robert | Ward | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 271517 | 26-Jun-15 | N/G |
| MR | Blaine | Warren | | | Durham | NC | USA | | 20-Aug-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Leigh | Warren | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 20-Aug-15 | N/G |
| Mrs. | Julie | Warshaw | | | Chapel Hill | North Caro | USA | 27517 | 10-Jun-15 | The poor planning and total lack of response in |
| | | | | | | | | | | regard to the local stations and routing for the light |
| | | | | | | | | | | rail system is an unfortunate indicator of the |
| | | | | | | | | | | problems this system will cause as a whole. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mrs | Suzanne | Waters | | • | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 1-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Robert | Weaver | | | Chapel Hill (Durham | NC | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | Low riders to warrant expense. |
| N/G | Catharina | Weaver | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 23-Jun-15 | To get a rail system to function it needs to cover all |
| | | | | | | | | | | of Triangle. |
| | | | | | | | | | | The area most benefiting from a light rail would be |
| | | | | | | | | | | Research Triangle Park and the Raleigh-Durham |
| | | | | | | | | | | Airport |
| Mrs | Mary | Webb | | • | Chapel Hill | North Caro | USA | 27514 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Michael | Webb | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | Please reject |
| MR | Aaron | Webel | | | Mineola | New York | USA | 11501 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Kym | Weed-Buzinski | | - | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 24-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Ms. | Janice | Welsh | | | Chapel Hill | North Caro | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Rose | Wenzel | | · | Chapel hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 14-Jul-15 | We, the public, have not received the necessary |
| | | | | | | | | | | objective information to make an informed decision |
| | | | | | | | | | | on this Durham-Orange Light Rail project |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Stephen | Whilden | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 16-Jun-15 | I like the idea of a light rail reducing congestion on |
| | | | | | | | | | | HWY 54, but it needs to be on the OTHER side of the |
| | | | | | | | | | | highway where there is NO development. Low- |
| | | | | | | | | | | emission buses would be a good substitute to the |
| | | | | | | | | | | current plan. |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mrs. | Courtney | Whilden | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 2-Sep-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Julia | Whitaker | | ı | Durham | NC | N/G | 27707 | 20-Jul-15 | I am in favor of transportation improvement. But |
| | | | | | | | | | | the LRT will cost more than it saves and is likely to |
| | | | | | | | | | | be obsolete by the time it is built. Not to mention |
| | | | | | | | | | | the environmental and residential negative impacts |
| | | | | | | | | | | it will have. Give us a more fiscally responsible |
| /0 | 12 | | | | 0 | | | 07547 700 | | option. |
| N/G | Kenneth | White | | I | Chapel Hill | North Caro | USA | 27517-722 | 17-Jun-15 | I am strongly opposed to going forward with the |
| | | | | | | | | | | proposed DO Light Rail Project. The project has the |
| | | | | | | | | | | potential to create nightmarish traffic problems on |
| | | | | | | | | | | major commuter roadways, be a noise and safety |
| | | | | | | | | | | hazard in established residential neighborhoods, |
| | | | | | | | | | | and be a huge tax burden on the citizens of these |
| | | | | | | | | | | communities. |
| mr | landon | whitt | | | hillshorough | nc | USA | 27278 | 12 Aug 15 | N/G |
| mr | landon | whitt | J | | hillsborough | nc | USA | 2/2/8 | 13-Aug-15 | טעוון |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|------------|----------------|----------------------|-------|---------|-------------------------|------------|--------|----------------|----------------------|--|
| N/G | Marc | Wiesenberg | | | Chapel Hill | N/G | N/G | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | The choice of the "preferred" Light Rail route is both inconsistent with the NC 54 corridor study and ignores areas within the City of Durham whose populace would actually benefit from an LRT line. Documented concerns regarding citizen serious safety and exacerbated existing traffic congestion issues, to name just two, have either been marginalized or simply ignored. Aside from these matters, the cost of this proposal, including an expectation of significant Federal assistance, makes this project ill-advised. Tax revenue would be far better utilized by funding current NC DOT plans to streamline Highway 54 between 15/501 and I-40. The implementation of these improvements would make a huge difference toward relieving traffic congestion for commuters, whose daily destinations rarely coincide with those serviced by the current LRT proposal. |
| Mrc | loni | Williams | | | Chanal Hill | NC | LICA | 27517 | 9 Jun 15 | N/C |
| Mrs. | Joni Robert | | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G N/G |
| Mr. Mr. | Travis | Williams Williams | | 1 | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 27517 | 8-Jun-15 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Carrie | Williams | | | Chapel Hill Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Jonathan | Williams | | | Chapel Hill | North Card | N/G | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | PLEASE, PLEASE do not proceed with Orange County-Durham County light rail project. (1) In my opinion this is not an acceptable use for tax payer dollars. (2) Personally, I hate to think of the disruption this will cause to my Downing Creek neighborhood. (3) IF there should be any light rail in the Triangle, and that is highly debatable, its primary goal should be to alleviate congestion on I-40. Orange CountyDurham County light rail plan does not. |
| Mrs. | Anne D. | Williams | | ! | Chapel Hill | North Card | USA | 27517 | 22-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mrs | Elizabeth | Williams | | _ | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 10-Sep-15 | I think the cost to use ratio is to high. Fix roads and bus lines. |
| ms | dottie | williford | | • | durham | North Card | USA | 27707 | 1-Jul-15 | stop the rail it ruins peoples homes |
| Ms | Diane | Willis | | | Chapel Hill | NC, Orange | USA | 27517 | 15-Jul-15 | This light rail project is worthless without going to RTP and the airport. The cost is way too high and the disruptions to neighborhoods are far too great. Let's do bus rapid transit instead, with much better coverage for a much lower cost. |
| Mr | Erik | Wilson | | | Raleigh | NC | USA | 27606 | 1-Oct-15 | We don't need this. We need to get out of debt |
| N/G | Alison | Windram | | + | Chapel Hill | N/G | USA | 27514 | 22-Sep-15 | NO LITE RAIL. DONT WASTE MY MONEY!! |
| Ms. | Leslie | Wiseman | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 4-Jul-15 | Does not go to the airport so not a fan. |
| N/G | Robin | Wood | | | Durham | NC | N/G | 27713 | 8-Aug-15 | N/G |

| Title | FirstName | Surname | Email | Address | Town/City | S/C/P | Region | Zip/PC | Date | Comment |
|-----------|---------------------------|-------------|-------|---------|--------------|-----------|--------|--------|-----------|---|
| Mrs | Rhonda | Woodell | | ' | Durham | North Car | USA | 27707 | 23-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Ms | Lucy | Woodell | | | Durham | Durham | N/G | 27707 | 24-Jul-15 | I feel further studies involving traffic, noise and ruining a wonderful residential setting is so unnecessary by putting the maintenance facility on Farrington Road when there other places that would be much more suited for this type of structure. I think some of the information presented to the affected neighborhoods is not accurate and some studies have been eliminated altogether it seems. This is simply not the place for what has been proposed. |
| Mr. | Philip | Woodell | | | Durham | NC | USA | 27707 | 24-Jul-15 | The light rail project is not needed because I feel that the ridership will be much less than what has been advertised. The proposed maintenance facility should not be located on Farrington Road because it will make traffic worst than it is already. |
| N/G | Regina | Wyatt | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 14-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Edward | Wyatt | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 14-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Trent | Yancey | | | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 12-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | younger | ye | 7 | | durham | N/G | N/G | 27707 | 27-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Younger | Ye | | | Durham | NC | N/G | 27707 | 14-Sep-15 | Waste of resources on rail that creates noise, pollution, property degradation, all but a solution to traffic. It must stop! |
| Mr | Richard | Yenoff | | • | Chapel Hill | NC | USA | 27517 | 21-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Dr. | Susan | Yeyeodu | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 13-Jul-15 | N/G |
| Mrs | Laura | Yost-Grande | | • | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 11-Jul-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Lesley | Young | | | Chapel Hill | North Car | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Stephen | Young | | | Chapel Hill | North Car | USA | 27517 | 8-Jun-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Jackie | Young | | | CHAPEL HILL | NC | USA | 27516 | 27-Aug-15 | N/G |
| mR | Edward | Zapolsky | | | Hillsborough | NC | N/G | 27278 | 1-Oct-15 | N/G |
| N/G | Xiao | Zhang | | | Apex | North Car | USA | 27539 | 12-Jun-15 | N/G |
| Mr | Bingjun | Zheng | | | Chapel Hill | NC | N/G | 27517 | 9-Jun-15 | N/G |
| * * * / 0 | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| | ield not collected by the | author | | | | | | | | |
| | not given by the signer | | | | | | | | | |
| | State, County or Provin | nce | | | | | | | | |
| * PC - Po | st Code | | | | | | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------|--|--|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | CLARE | ABRAHAMSON | PROPOSED DURHAM ORANGE LIGHT RAIL PROJECT AND AM PURSUING MORE COST EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVES THAT WILL MEET THE LONG TERM NEEDS OF THE REGION. | Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (CRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | | | |
| Ms | Marilyn | Agney | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Dona | Aguayo | No Depot on Farrington Rd. | Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives | | | |
| N/G | Barbara | Ailsworth | N/G | considered. | | | |
| Mrs | Kimberly | Aitken | I do not want this noisy place so close to my nice housing community and am worried it will lower my house value. Please find a non-residential location. | As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. The determination is based on the noise and vibration analysis conducted in accordance with FTA guidance. | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-------------|---|---|------------|------------|------------|
| Mrs | Kimberly | Aitken | with nice communities of school children, retirees, and hard working people who have worked their lives to be able to live in these homes. An industrial facility like this has no place in this area and should find a more business oriented industrial location. | As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to participate in the design as part of the City and/or County approval process. | | | |
| Mrs. | Alyssa | Alegre | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Louis | Almekinders | N/G | | | | |
| ms | jennifer | anderson | N/G | | | | |
| Dr | Thomas | Anderson | Terrible waste of my tax dollars. Please don't build this expensive piece of junk. | Comment Noted | | | |
| Ms | Elizabeth | Andrews | N/G | | | | |
| | Dave | Anna | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Mark | Anna | Commuter populations | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | | | |
| | | | don't travel these routes | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | | | |
| | | | as is. The general | the year 2035. For more | | | |
| | | | population doesn't travel | information about ridership please | | | |
| | | | to either downtown | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | | | |
| | | | chapel hill or Durham on | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | | | |
| | | | a regular basis. A major | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | | | |
| | | | waste of money that | and Results Report. As noted in the | | | |
| | | | couldn't be diverted | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | | | |
| | | | towards usable | region's existing transit network is | | | |
| | | | infrastructure. | currently operating at close to | | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | | |
| Mr. | Michael | Anna | I am strongly opposed to | Comment Noted | | | |
| | | | the current plan for this | | | | |
| | | | light rail system. | | | | |
| N/G | Kathrynne | Anna | N/G | | | | |
| | | Archin | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | N. J. | B. | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Bok | Baek | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|
| Dr | Ann | Bailey | of the growth in the RTP | GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and | | | |
| Mrs | ross | baker | it should be built above grade level. At ground level, people south of the railway will be trapped in | Section 4.12.4.6 states that Triangle Transit will coordinate with law enforcement, emergency and medical personnel, and other public agencies to investigate impacts of the light rail system on their day-to-day operations. | | | |
| N/G | Jeff | Baldino | N/G | | | | |
| | | Baldino | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|------------------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | i ii sti idili c | Last Hame | | Nesponse 1 | | nesponse s | nesponse : |
| N/G | Deborah | Barab | The financial numbers | The Wake County Transit Plan is | | | |
| | | | need to be re-crunched. | currently evaluating future potential | | | |
| | | | The cost vs. need/use | transit corridors, which could be | | | |
| | | | does not seem realistic or | studied if a funding source is | | | |
| | | | feasible. I think that the | secured for transit in Wake County. | | | |
| | | | companies associated | The Wake County Transit Plan is | | | |
| | | | with the building of this | currently under development. For | | | |
| | | | project are pushing to | more information, please see | | | |
| | | | hard and not using | WakeTransit.com | | | |
| | | | reasonable arguments for | | | | |
| | | | the need. It's like the | | | | |
| | | | apples to apples | | | | |
| | | | argument. You've got | | | | |
| | | | apples to squash. (not | | | | |
| | | | even fruit) As a Durham | | | | |
| | | | resident, I ask you to | | | | |
| | | | review the need vs cost. | | | | |
| | | | Would make more sense | | | | |
| | | | to connect Raleigh to | | | | |
| | | | Durham before Chapel | | | | |
| | | | Hill. (and I love Chapel | | | | |
| | | | Hill) | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Natalie | Barbare | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Marcia | Barfield | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | William T. | Barfield | N/G | | | | |
| | Toby | | | | | | |
| N/G | Kaye | Barker | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Ted | Barrow | Cutting off proper vehicle | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | | | |
| 11, | lea | Barrow | access to and from the | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | | | |
| | | | areas south of the light | Project on the existing roadway | | | |
| | | | - | network and any measures | | | |
| | | | will only create | recommended to mitigate such | | | |
| | | | · · | impacts. Technical reports that | | | |
| | | | | report the results of traffic | | | |
| | | | | simulations are included as | | | |
| | | | | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | | | |
| | | | - | DEIS. | | | |
| | | | Meadowmont was | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | | | |
| | | | | proposed mitigation measures that | | | |
| | | | - | are planned to mitigate for project- | | | |
| | | | • | related roadway effects. These | | | |
| | | | compared to the area | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | | | |
| | | | • | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | | | |
| | | | affected by C2/C2A. | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | | | |
| | | | | roadway project planned by the | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | | | |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | | | |
| | | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | | | |
| | | | | continue to coordinate with the | | | |
| | | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | | | |
| | | | | projects advance. | | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | | | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Alice | Barrow | I do not agree with the | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | To avoid the potential for | | |
| | | | light rail project crossing | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | incidents at -grade intersections, | | |
| | | | the intersection of Barbee | Project on the existing roadway | crossings would be signalized or | | |
| | | | Chapel Road nor the | network and any measures | equipped with gates with bells to | | |
| | | | other 3 intersections near | recommended to mitigate such | warn of oncoming trains. The | | |
| | | | it. This will cause too | impacts. Technical reports that | trains will also have bells and | | |
| | | | much congestion and | report the results of traffic | horns. Bells, gates, and horns | | |
| | | | create safety issues for | simulations are included as | would be activated according to | | |
| | | | the many people who | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | Triangle Transit operating | | |
| | | | already commute using | DEIS. | procedures and safety guidelines. | | |
| | | | Barbee Chapel to access | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | NC 54 will continue to be | | |
| | | | route 54. This would only | proposed mitigation measures that | coordinated in the east/west | | |
| | | | be safe and sane if a | are planned to mitigate for project- | direction. Under a separate | | |
| | | | bridge was built for the | related roadway effects. These | planned NCDOT project, the | | |
| | | | light rail to go over these | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | nearest signal that would impact | | |
| | | | intersections. | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | westbound NC 54 is located over | | |
| | | | In addition, the original | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | 3,800 feet to the west of | | |
| | | | plan of the rail going | roadway project planned by the | Littlejohn Road. The nearest | | |
| | | | through Meadowmont | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | signal that would impact | | |
| | | | should not now be | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | eastbound NC 54 is located | | |
| | | | changed to the detriment | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | approximately 4,500 feet to the | | |
| | | | of those living south of | continue to coordinate with the | east at Falconbridge Road and | | |
| | | | 54. | NCDOT as the designs of these | should not impact vehicles | | |
| | | | | projects advance. | exiting from Downing Creek | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | Parkway or Littlejohn Road. The | | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | northbound Littlejohn Road left | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | turn to westbound NC 54 | | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | currently has very limited usage | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | with less than 10 vehicles per | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | hour performing this maneuver | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | in both the AM and PM peak | | |
| N/G | Taren | Basnight | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| N/G | Anthony | Batton | I feel the light rail as | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | Parking is proposed at several | NC 54 will continue to be | |
| | ŕ | | presented is a waste of | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | stations as described in DEIS | coordinated in the east/west | |
| | | | money. It falls short on | Project on the existing roadway | section 3.3. The number of | direction. Under a separate | |
| | | | providing parking and | network and any measures | parking spaces proposed varies | planned NCDOT project, the | |
| | | | weather protection for | recommended to mitigate such | and are based on forecasted | nearest signal that would impact | |
| | | | riders if it has riders. This | impacts. Technical reports that | ridership and land availability. | westbound NC 54 is located over | |
| | | | area's culture is drive solo | report the results of traffic | Stations with park-and-ride | 3,800 feet to the west of | |
| | | | first. Many do this to have | simulations are included as | facilities would include bus bays | Littlejohn Road. The nearest | |
| | | | transportation available in | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | for connecting feeder bus routes | signal that would impact | |
| | | | case of emergency be it a | | and "kiss-and-ride" spaces for | eastbound NC 54 is located | |
| | | | | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | passenger pick-up and drop-off. | approximately 4,500 feet to the | |
| | | | why carpooling and buses | proposed mitigation measures that | | east at Falconbridge Road and | |
| | | | as ideas have failed or are | are planned to mitigate for project- | accessed primarily by | should not impact vehicles exiting | |
| | | | seldom used. It will cause | related roadway effects. These | pedestrians, bicyclists, and | from Downing Creek Parkway or | |
| | | | unprecedented traffic | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | passengers transferring from bus | Littlejohn Road. The northbound | |
| | | | delays for Barbee Chapel | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | service. In general, automobile | Littlejohn Road left turn to | |
| | | | Road which gets worse | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | parking would not be provided at | westbound NC 54 currently has | |
| | | | with every passing day. If | roadway project planned by the | walk-up stations (section | very limited usage with less than | |
| | | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | 2.3.2.1). See also typical images | 10 vehicles per hour performing | |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | on p.2-23 and conceptual designs | this maneuver in both the AM | |
| | | | resounding "I told you | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | in appendix L. | and PM peak hours. Downing | |
| | | | so" every 10-15 minutes | continue to coordinate with the | | Creek Parkway is configured | |
| | | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | | today as an eastbound NC 54 | |
| | | | round and round. | projects advance. | | right turn to southbound | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | Downing Creek Parkway and a | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | northbound Downing Creek | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | | Parkway right turn to eastbound | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | | NC 54. This configuration will be | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | | maintained in the LRT build | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | | condition. The stop/yield | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | | controlled right turns do not | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|---|--|------------|------------|
| Mrs. | Betsy | Batton | | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection | northbound Littlejohn Road left turn to westbound NC 54 currently has very limited usage with less than 10 vehicles per hour performing this maneuver in both the AM and PM peak hours. Downing Creek Parkway is configured today as an eastbound NC 54 right turn to southbound Downing Creek Parkway and a northbound Downing Creek Parkway right turn to eastbound NC 54. This configuration will be maintained in the LRT build condition. The | | |
| Mrs | Tanja | Bauer | N/G | approaches to accommodate | stop/yield controlled right turns | | |
| Mr | Daniel | Bauer | N/G | | | | |
| Mrs | Kimberly | Bauer | N/G | | | | |
| | Eugene | Bauer | N/G | | | | |
| | Ginger | Bauer | proposed light rail system. | Comment Noted | | | |
| | Steven | Bearden | N/G | | | | |
| | bradford | becken | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Larry | Beckler | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|--|---|--|------------|
| Dr. | Joanne | Beckman | stops. If public transportation is needed, buses or vans are preferable, because routes can be changed to accomodate technology, population changes. and economical needs of the community as it develops. Light rail is not cost- | Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. Ontime performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse than the overall Triangle Transit system average (Table 1.3-1 and Figure 1.3-3). | In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and businesses, the region needs a multi-modal transportation system, including improved high-quality transit service. The D-O Corridor needs a long term solution that provides accessible transit service, and a competitive and reliable alternative to congested roadways; that seamlessly serves many popular destinations in Durham and Chapel Hill, and that fosters growth, compact development, and economic development along a high-capacity transportation network (ES-5). | |
| N/G | David | Bell | I reject the current proposal, but I am in favor of a Durham-Orange Light Rail project. | Comment Noted | | | |
| Ms | Sharon | Bellmore | Please reject the current proposed track down through Farrington Rd. | Comment Noted | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|---|------------|------------|
| N/G | Dane | Berglund | The Lite Rail train system will potentially ruin our residential retirement community | Comment Noted | | | |
| Dr | Marcus | Berzofsky | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Anne | Billings | I oppose the current DO Light Rail Project and strongly urge that all facets of the plan be re- evaluated by an independent organization. | Comment Noted | | | |
| N/G | Timothy | Billings | stop this | Comment Noted | | | |
| | David | Biswell | N/G | | | | |
| Mrs | Sue | Biswell | | As described in Table 2.3-2 and further detailed in Table 3.3-2, park-and-ride facilities are currently planned at the following stations: - Friday Center - Leigh Village - Gateway - MLK Jr. Parkway - South Square - Durham - Dillard Street - Alston Avenue. | Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Ms. | Lori | Black | The project as it is | In general, the project is not | GoTriangle forecasts an average | | |
| | | | currently conceived is | expected to have a significant effect | of 23,000 weekday light rail trips | | |
| | | | -based on fundamentally | on traffic on those roadways where | by the year 2035. For more | | |
| | | | unsound ridership | it is close to D-O LRT Project. | information about ridership | | |
| | | | projections and will not | However, the D-O LRT Project will | please see DEIS Section 3.1: | | |
| | | | result in any appreciable | provide a competitive and reliable | Public Transportation and DEIS | | |
| | | | reduction in automobile | travel alternative to the congestion | Appendix K2: Travel Demand | | |
| | | | congestion in the Chapel | on these roadways, particularly | Methodology and Results Report. | | |
| | | | Hill-Durham road | during the peak traffic hours. | As noted in the Executive | | |
| | | | corridor. | | Summary (ES-5), the region's | | |
| | | | -the routing of the | | existing transit network is | | |
| | | | proposed light rail track is | | currently operating at close to | | |
| | | | not aligned with the | | maximum capacity including 84 | | |
| | | | higher density compact | | buses per hour servicing UNC | | |
| | | | neighborhood | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | |
| | | | developments in Orange | | servicing Duke University and | | |
| | | | and Chatham counties. | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | |
| | | | -there is no incentive to | | Medical Centers. As further | | |
| | | | take light rail to reduce | | detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose | | |
| | | | travel time between | | and Need, this combination of | | |
| | | | Durham and Chapel Hill | | bus routes that currently serve | | |
| | | | -Ridership farebox | | the D-O Corridor and provide a | | |
| | | | collection only supports a | | high level of transit service | | |
| | | | small percentage of the | | (Figure 1.5-2). However, there | | |
| | | | annual operating costs. | | are portions of the corridor | | |
| | | | -A population density of | | within Chapel Hill and between | | |
| | | | 30 people per gross acre, | | Duke and downtown Durham | | |
| | | | or roughly 19,000 people | | where, due to congestion, adding | | |
| | | | per square mile (ppsm), is | | additional buses will not improve | | |
| | | | necessary in order to | | service, as discussed further in | | |
| | | | support light rail transit. | | DEIS section 3.2. | | |
| N/G | Robin | Blackmon | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Mr | Tony | Blake | Ask yourself if LRT will | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | Various transit technologies were | | |
| | , | | | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | previously studied and evaluated | | |
| | | | | the year 2035. For more | in an extensive public process | | |
| | | | for whom. How it is | information about ridership please | called the "Alternatives Analysis" | | |
| | | | rational people justify | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | (AA). Technologies considered | | |
| | | | ' ' ' | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | during the AA included: | | |
| | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | conventional bus, Bus Rapid | | |
| | | | are any guide) for an | and Results Report. As noted in the | Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail | | |
| | | | inflexible 17 mile system | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail | | |
| | | | through a critical | region's existing transit network is | Transit (CRT). Through the | | |
| | | | watershed that will be | currently operating at close to | Alternatives Analysis, light rail | | |
| | | | made mostly irrelevant by | maximum capacity including 84 | was selected as the best transit | | |
| | | | technology before it is | buses per hour servicing UNC | technology option to best serve | | |
| | | | completed? | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | the Durham-Orange Corridor and | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | to meet the Purpose and Need of | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | the proposed transit project. The | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | findings of the Alternatives | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | of the DEIS. The Alternatives | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | Analysis is available on | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | ourtransitfuture.com. | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | | |
| _ | Laura | Blank | N/G | | | | |
| | Edward | Blasius | N/G | | | | |
| | pat | blasius | N/G | | | | |
| | | Blazing | N/G | | | | |
| | - | Boccieri | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Christopher | Boehlke | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Mr | Kenneth | Bogue | Light rail may cost | o o | As described in DEIS section 8.1 | | |
| | | | \$1,600,000,000 to | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | and further explained in DEIS | | |
| | | | construct (or more if | the year 2035. For more | chapter 1, the investment | | |
| | | | there are cost overruns). | information about ridership please | benefits of a project like the D-O | | |
| | | | Light rail, in 2040, may | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | LRT include: improved mobility, | | |
| | | | serve up to 11,500 | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | increased connectivity through | | |
| | | | citizens each workday. | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | expanded transit options, and | | |
| | | | Some reasonable | and Results Report. As noted in the | support of future development | | |
| | | | projections of ridership | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | |
| | | | are as low as 5,000 | region's existing transit network is | provide a competitive, reliable | | |
| | | | citizens per workday. | currently operating at close to | alternative to automobile use | | |
| | | | This is an investment of | maximum capacity including 84 | that supports compact | | |
| | | | about \$140,000 to | buses per hour servicing UNC | development. | | |
| | | | \$320,000 for each and | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | | |
| | | | every citizen who might | servicing Duke University and | Enhanced mobility will also | | |
| | | | benefit from a light rail | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | increase transit operating | | |
| | | | system. This cost to | Medical Centers. As further detailed | efficiency: offer a competitive, | | |
| | | | benefit ratio does not | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | reliable transportation solution | | |
| | | | make sense. This cost to | this combination of bus routes that | that will reduce travel time. | | |
| | | | benefit ratio is not | currently serve the D-O Corridor | Increased connectivity will | | |
| | | | sustainable nor affordable | and provide a high level of transit | expand transit options between | | |
| | | | at the local, state, or | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | Durham and Chapel Hill by | | |
| | | | federal level. | there are portions of the corridor | enhancing and seamlessly | | |
| | | | The proposed light rail | within Chapel Hill and between | connecting with the existing | | |
| | | | system should not be | Duke and downtown Durham | transit system. | | |
| | | | built because it costs too | where, due to congestion, adding | | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | In addition, increased | | |
| | | | small a portion of the | | connectivity will serve major | | |
| | | | · | section 3.2. | activity and employment centers | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | Durham counties. | of life and attract new residents and | the University of North Carolina | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Ms | Elizabeth | Bonnet | Light rail may cost | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | As described in DEIS section 8.1 | | |
| | | | \$1,600,000,000 to | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | and further explained in DEIS | | |
| | | | construct (or more if | the year 2035. For more | chapter 1, the investment | | |
| | | | there are cost overruns). | information about ridership please | benefits of a project like the D-O | | |
| | | | Light rail, in 2040, may | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | LRT include: improved mobility, | | |
| | | | serve up to 11,500 | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | increased connectivity through | | |
| | | | citizens each workday. | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | expanded transit options, and | | |
| | | | Some reasonable | and Results Report. As noted in the | support of future development | | |
| | | | projections of ridership | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | |
| | | | are as low as 5,000 | region's existing transit network is | provide a competitive, reliable | | |
| | | | citizens per workday. | currently operating at close to | alternative to automobile use | | |
| | | | This is an investment of | maximum capacity including 84 | that supports compact | | |
| | | | about \$140,000 to | buses per hour servicing UNC | development. | | |
| | | | \$320,000 for each and | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | | |
| | | | every citizen who might | servicing Duke University and | Enhanced mobility will also | | |
| | | | benefit from a light rail | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | increase transit operating | | |
| | | | system. This cost to | Medical Centers. As further detailed | efficiency: offer a competitive, | | |
| | | | benefit ratio does not | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | reliable transportation solution | | |
| | | | make sense. This cost to | this combination of bus routes that | that will reduce travel time. | | |
| | | | benefit ratio is not | currently serve the D-O Corridor | Increased connectivity will | | |
| | | | sustainable nor affordable | and provide a high level of transit | expand transit options between | | |
| | | | at the local, state, or | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | Durham and Chapel Hill by | | |
| | | | federal level. | there are portions of the corridor | enhancing and seamlessly | | |
| | | | The proposed light rail | within Chapel Hill and between | connecting with the existing | | |
| | | | system should not be | Duke and downtown Durham | transit system. | | |
| | | | built because it costs too | where, due to congestion, adding | | | |
| | | | much and will serve too | additional buses will not improve | In addition, increased | | |
| | | | small a portion of the | service, as discussed further in DEIS | connectivity will serve major | | |
| | | | 500,000 people who now | section 3.2. | activity and employment centers | | |
| | | | reside in Orange and | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | Durham counties. | of life and attract new residents and | the University of North Carolina | | |
| N/G | Rebecca | Bostian | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Michael | Bostian | N/G | | | | |
| m | Robert | Bowerman | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Kathy | Bowerman | N/G | | | | |
| Dr | Laura | Bowers | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|---|---|------------|
| N/G | Ellen | Boylan | much less expensive, more flexible, and less disruptive for our communities. | Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. Ontime performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse than the overall Triangle Transit system average (Table 1.3-1 and Figure 1.3-3). | region needs a multi-modal transportation system, including improved high-quality transit service. The D-O Corridor needs a long term solution that provides accessible transit service, and a competitive and reliable alternative to congested roadways; that seamlessly serves many popular destinations in Durham and Chapel Hill, and that fosters growth, compact development, and economic | |
| N/G | Richard C | Boylan Jr | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Lisa | Brach | Please do not waste my taxpayer money on a system that is doomed by its design and will ultimately have a negative impact on my neighborhood, our community and the whole City of Durham! | Comment Noted | | | |
| N/G | stephen | brackett | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Steve | Brackett | N/G | | | | |

| Ms. Walter N/G Rosemary Brookman Rosemary Roseman Rosema | Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|--|-------|-----------|-----------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Note Note Note Note Note Note Note Note | Ms | Kathrvn | Breen | N/G | | | | |
| Rosemary Rosemary Brookman Light rails ir responsible for more deaths and accidents than any other form of transportation except motorcycles. This is a bad solution. Enchanced bus service would solve the problem with much less cost and much less environmental impact. Roseman Roseman | Mr. | | Brittle | N/G | | | | |
| N/G Daniel Bruce N/G | N/G | Rosemary | | Light rail is responsible for more deaths and accidents than any other form of transportation except motorcycles. This is a bad solution. Enchanced bus service would solve the problem with much less cost and much less environmental impact. | previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available | very safe mode of transportation. Per FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics Report available on the site referenced above, crash rates for rail transit in the US ranged from 2.16 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles for the six-year study period in that report. For comparison, statistics on motor vehicle crash rates are available from NCDOT at the following link: https://connect.ncdot.gov/resou rces/safety/pages/crashdata.aspx. | over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On- time performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse than the overall Triangle Transit system average (Table 1.3- 1 and Figure 1.3-3). As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of | quality of life and attract new residents and businesses, the region needs a multi-modal transportation system, including improved high-quality transit service. The D-O Corridor needs a long term solution that provides accessible transit service, and a competitive and reliable alternative to congested roadways; that seamlessly serves many popular destinations in Durham and Chapel Hill, and that fosters growth, compact development, and economic development along a high-capacity transportation network |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|----------------|----------------|--|---------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | buchanan | I grew up two miles from here and bought this house five years ago, as my forever home. Now there is a plan to make, literally, my backyard into | Comment Noted | Response 2 | response 3 | Response 4 |
| | | | the train line. I object and will continue to object until they drop the plan completely as there is not now and will never be a need for a light rail in the triangle of NC at all. | | | | |
| N/G | MEGAN | BUCKLEY | N/G | | | | |
| | | Buckley | N/G | | | | |
| | | Bulthuis | N/G | | | | |
| | Lauren Gary | Burke Burke | N/G N/G | | | | |
| | Brian | Burke | N/G | | | | |
| | | Burke | N/G | | | | |
| | Edith | Burns | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | | Burson | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Mr. | Eric | Butler | Light rail is not the proper | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | GoTriangle forecasts an average | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce | Various transit technologies were |
| | | | solution for our | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | of 23,000 weekday light rail trips | or eliminate pedestrian and | previously studied and evaluated |
| | | | community. It cost too | Project on the existing roadway | by the year 2035. For more | motorist conflicts with transit | in an extensive public process |
| | | | much money, will never | network and any measures | information about ridership | vehicles. | called the "Alternatives Analysis" |
| | | | reach sustainable | recommended to mitigate such | please see DEIS Section 3.1: | Detailed information regarding | (AA). Technologies considered |
| | | | ridership levels and will | impacts. Technical reports that | Public Transportation and DEIS | the roadways, sidewalks, and | during the AA included: |
| | | | be a public burden. | report the results of traffic | Appendix K2: Travel Demand | trails expected to be affected by | conventional bus, Bus Rapid |
| | | | Further, it will certainly | simulations are included as | Methodology and Results Report. | the proposed D-O LRT Project is | Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail |
| | | | cause many fatalities | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | As noted in the Executive | provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS | Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail |
| | | | which could have been | DEIS. | Summary (ES-5), the region's | section 3.6, and the Basis for | Transit (CRT). Through the |
| | | | avoided due to excessive | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | existing transit network is | Engineering Design (appendix L). | Alternatives Analysis, light rail was |
| | | | at grade crossings. With | proposed mitigation measures that | currently operating at close to | To avoid the potential for | selected as the best transit |
| | | | regard to the local 54 | are planned to mitigate for project- | | incidents at -grade intersections, | technology option to best serve |
| | | | corridor, it will increase | related roadway effects. These | buses per hour servicing UNC | crossings would be signalized or | the Durham-Orange Corridor and |
| | | | congestion by usurping | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | equipped with gates with bells to | to meet the Purpose and Need of |
| | | | other more narrowly | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | servicing Duke University and | warn of oncoming trains. The | the proposed transit project. The |
| | | | focused and thoughtful | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | trains will also have bells and | findings of the Alternatives |
| | | | traffic solutions. With | roadway project planned by the | Medical Centers. As further | horns. Bells, gates, and horns | Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 |
| | | | regard to Downing Creek, | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose | would be activated according to | of the DEIS. The Alternatives |
| | | | it will cut off access and | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | and Need, this combination of | Triangle Transit operating | Analysis is available on |
| | | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | bus routes that currently serve | procedures and safety guidelines. | ourtransitfuture.com. |
| | | | to the hundreds of | continue to coordinate with the | the D-O Corridor and provide a | , , , | |
| | | | families in our | NCDOT as the designs of these | high level of transit service | | |
| | | | neighborhood. | projects advance. | (Figure 1.5-2). However, there | | |
| | | | All in all, the antiquated | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | are portions of the corridor | | |
| | | | concept of light rail | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | within Chapel Hill and between | | |
| | | | should be abandoned as | substantial modifications to the | Duke and downtown Durham | | |
| | | | outdated and | roadway are incorporated into the | where, due to congestion, adding | | |
| | | | intellectually dull and | design including additional turn | additional buses will not improve | | |
| | | | lazy. The area would be | bays and restriping of intersection | service, as discussed further in | | |
| | | | better served by doing | approaches to accommodate | DEIS section 3.2. | | |
| Ms. | Megan | Butler | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Steven | Buzinski | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Carol | Bylinski | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Freddy | Byrth | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Alex | Cabanes | _ | Triangle Transit has continually | | | |
| | | | Creek, myself and others | reviewed the project and have | | | |
| | | | in the neighboring | made modifications to alterantives | | | |
| | | | communities have | or added alternatives based on | | | |
| | | | 1 ' ' ' | public and stakeholder feedback. | | | |
| | | | concerns about the | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or | | | |
| | | | impact and safety of the | eliminate pedestrian and motorist | | | |
| | | | proposed C2/C2A at- | conflicts with transit vehicles. | | | |
| | | | grade routing along the | Detailed information regarding the | | | |
| | | | NC54 corridor. Despite | roadways, sidewalks, and trails | | | |
| | | | repeated requests and | expected to be affected by the | | | |
| | | | outreach by the | proposed D-O LRT Project is | | | |
| | | | community, GoTriangle | provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS | | | |
| | | | has to date failed to | section 3.6, and the Basis for | | | |
| | | | address these community | Engineering Design (appendix L). | | | |
| | | | concerns. These concerns | To avoid the potential for incidents | | | |
| | | | have been discussed on | at -grade intersections, crossings | | | |
| | | | numerous occasions | would be signalized or equipped | | | |
| | | | directly with GoTriangle | with gates with bells to warn of | | | |
| | | | representatives in public | oncoming trains. The trains will also | | | |
| | | | and private forums, email, | have bells and horns. Bells, gates, | | | |
| | | | phone, letters, surveys, | and horns would be activated | | | |
| | | | etc. Needless to say, this | according to Triangle Transit | | | |
| | | | is extremely frustrating | operating procedures and safety | | | |
| | | | for the over 90% of local | guidelines. | | | |
| | | | residents in opposition to | | | | |
| | | | the C2/C2A at-grade | | | | |
| | | | routing who believe their | | | | |
| | | | voices are not being | | | | |
| | | | heard or interests | | | | |
| | | | adequately represented. | | | | 1 |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|--------|-----------|------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|------------|
| Mrc | Pam | Calderwood | The costs benefit is just | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce | As described in DEIS section 8.1 | |
| IVII 3 | i aiii | Calactwood | not there for light rail - | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | _ | and further explained in DEIS | |
| | | | just see the amount of | the year 2035. For more | • | chapter 1, the investment | |
| | | | people taking buses | information about ridership please | | benefits of a project like the D-O | |
| | | | | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | | LRT include: improved mobility, | |
| | | | groups. | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | | increased connectivity through | |
| | | | Safety is also an issue | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | | expanded transit options, and | |
| | | | | and Results Report. As noted in the | • | support of future development | |
| | | | | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS | 1 | |
| | | | · · | region's existing transit network is | I * | provide a competitive, reliable | |
| | | | children riding bikes | currently operating at close to | | alternative to automobile use | |
| | | | everywhere! | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | that supports compact | |
| | | | everywhere: | maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC | | development. | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | crossings would be signalized or | development. | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | equipped with gates with bells to | Enhanced mobility will also | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | increase transit operating | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | _ | efficiency: offer a competitive, | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | | reliable transportation solution | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | would be activated according to | that will reduce travel time. | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | <u> </u> | Increased connectivity will | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | procedures and safety guidelines. | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | l' - | Durham and Chapel Hill by | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | | enhancing and seamlessly | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | connecting with the existing | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | transit system. | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | transit system. | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | | In addition, increased | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | between Durham and Chapel Hill: | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| | | | | or line and attract new residents and | | the University of North Carolina | |

| | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-----|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Ms | Caroline | Cameron | My main concern is the | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or | GoTriangle forecasts an average | Parking is proposed at several | As described in DEIS section 8.1 |
| | | | safety of the rail, | eliminate pedestrian and motorist | of 23,000 weekday light rail trips | stations as described in DEIS | and further explained in DEIS |
| | | | especially the C2A route. | conflicts with transit vehicles. | by the year 2035. For more | section 3.3. As described in Table | chapter 1, the investment benefits |
| | | | There will be 3 at-grade | Detailed information regarding the | information about ridership | 2.3-2 and further detailed in | of a project like the D-O LRT |
| | | | crossings, two of them | roadways, sidewalks, and trails | please see DEIS Section 3.1: | Table 3.3-2, park-and-ride | include: improved mobility, |
| | | | are the entrances to | expected to be affected by the | Public Transportation and DEIS | facilities are currently planned at | increased connectivity through |
| | | | ~ | proposed D-O LRT Project is | | the following stations: | expanded transit options, and |
| | | | within a 1/2 miles stretch. | provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS | Methodology and Results Report. | Friday Center | support of future development |
| | | | This is a set-up for the | section 3.6, and the Basis for | As noted in the Executive | Leigh Village | plans. Enhanced mobility will |
| | | | worst-case scenario - the | Engineering Design (appendix L). | Summary (ES-5), the region's | Gateway | provide a competitive, reliable |
| | | | train hitting a car or a bus. | To avoid the potential for incidents | existing transit network is | • MLK Jr. Parkway | alternative to automobile use that |
| | | | The traffic on NC54 | at -grade intersections, crossings | currently operating at close to | South Square | supports compact development. |
| | | | comes to a stop during | would be signalized or equipped | maximum capacity including 84 | Durham | |
| | | | peak times and there will | with gates with bells to warn of | buses per hour servicing UNC | Dillard Street | Enhanced mobility will also |
| | | | be no traffic lights | oncoming trains. The trains will also | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | Alston Avenue | increase transit operating |
| | | | guaranteeing access to | have bells and horns. Bells, gates, | servicing Duke University and | | efficiency: offer a competitive, |
| | | | NC54 and there is a real | and horns would be activated | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | The number of parking spaces | reliable transportation solution |
| | | | potential a car will get | according to Triangle Transit | Medical Centers. As further | proposed varies and are based on | that will reduce travel time. |
| | | | stuck on the tracks and | operating procedures and safety | detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose | forecasted ridership and land | Increased connectivity will expand |
| | | | the gate will come down | guidelines. | and Need, this combination of | availability. Stations with park- | transit options between Durham |
| | | | behind the car, trapping | | bus routes that currently serve | and-ride facilities would include | and Chapel Hill by enhancing and |
| | | | the car. The fact that | | the D-O Corridor and provide a | bus bays for connecting feeder | seamlessly connecting with the |
| | | | there are going to be | | high level of transit service | bus routes and "kiss-and-ride" | existing transit system. |
| | | | numerous stations | | (Figure 1.5-2). However, there | spaces for passenger pick-up and | |
| | | | without parking or any | | are portions of the corridor | drop-off. | In addition, increased connectivity |
| | | | additional parking is also | | within Chapel Hill and between | Walk-up stations would be | will serve major activity and |
| | | | a boondoggle. The fact | | Duke and downtown Durham | accessed primarily by | employment centers between |
| | | | that technology has | | where, due to congestion, adding | pedestrians, bicyclists, and | Durham and Chapel Hill: the |
| | | | moved beyond light rail is | | additional buses will not improve | passengers transferring from bus | University of North Carolina at |
| | | | also very short sighted | | service, as discussed further in | service. In general, automobile | Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, |
| | | | especially for the billions | | DEIS section 3.2. | parking would not be provided at | US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West |
| Mr. | Keith | Cameron | Please note that the vast | Comment Noted | | | |
| | | | majority of taxpayers | | | | |
| | | | affected by this project | | | | |
| | | | would not use it and DO | | | | |
| | | | NOT WANT IT! | | | | |
| N/G | Christina | Cameron | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | | Cameron | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Harriet | Cannon | The planning commitee of | Comment Noted | | | |
| , - | | | Durham is being run by | | | | |
| | | | folks who have little | | | | |
| | | | interest in the thoughts | | | | |
| | | | or feelings of anyone they | | | | |
| | | | don't consider | | | | |
| | | | "progressive" I have lived | | | | |
| | | | in Durham all my life and | | | | |
| | | | love the fact that it has | | | | |
| | | | never felt or been urban. I | | | | |
| | | | am not a fan of light rail | | | | |
| | | | and what it will do to the | | | | |
| | | | hometown feel of | | | | |
| | | | Durham. It is going to ruin | | | | |
| | | | a lot of nice | | | | |
| | | | neighborhood. If urban is | | | | |
| | | | where these planners | | | | |
| | | | want to live, they should | | | | |
| | | | move to or back to a big | | | | |
| | | | urbanized city instead of | | | | |
| | | | trying to change ours. | | | | |
| | | | ., | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------|-----------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | John | Capell | I oppose the crossing | The Town of Chapel Hill requested | The C1A Alternative has the | | |
| , - | | | planned at Downing | that alternatives to the C1 | longest length of the Little Creek | | |
| | | | Creek. | alignments be studied as part of the | | | |
| | | | | Alternatives Analysis for the Project. | | | |
| | | | | As a result, the Project team | ridership of the Little Creek | | |
| | | | | developed the C2 alignments as part | • | | |
| | | | | of the Alternatives Analysis. In | to the natural environment, the | | |
| | | | | February 2012, the Durham-Chapel | C1A Alternative would impact | | |
| | | | | Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning | • | | |
| | | | | Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted | wetlands associated with Little | | |
| | | | | the proposed D-O LRT Project, | Creek, in particular, the Little | | |
| | | | | including both the C1 and C2 | Creek Bottomlands and Slopes | | |
| | | | | alignment corridors. | Significant Natural Heritage Area | | |
| | | | | | on the periphery of the USACE- | | |
| | | | | The Town of Chapel Hill expressed | owned property. | | |
| | | | | its preference for an alignment | | | |
| | | | | running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A | Therefore, as compared to the | | |
| | | | | Alternatives) that would be more | NEPA Preferred Alternative (C2A) | | |
| | | | | supportive of planned future | and the other alternatives, the | | |
| | | | | growth than C1 and C1A | C1A Alternative would not | | |
| | | | | Alternatives. These alternatives | minimize adverse impacts to the | | |
| | | | | would result in a conversion of less | natural environment or use and | | |
| | | | | dense land uses into higher density | enhance existing and | | |
| | | | | uses near stations. These impacts | underutilized transportation | | |
| | | | | are considered beneficial and | rights-of-way. | | |
| | | | | consistent with local planning. | | | |
| | | | | | The evaluation of the NEPA | | |
| | | | | The C1 Alternative would impact | Preferred Alternative and all | | |
| | | | | undisturbed natural areas including | Project Element Alternatives are | | |
| | | | | the Little Creek Bottomlands and | included in the DEIS and are | | |
| | | | | Slopes Significant Natural Heritage | summarized in DEIS chapter 8, | | |
| N/G | Linda | Carmichael | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|------------|------------|------------|
| ms | maureen | carroll | please think about how much good the money you folks have tossed down the drain for no | The DEIS public comment period is one of the many the opportunities for stakeholders and the public to review the D-O LRT Project and provide input. | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
| | | | veterans, helping the homelessa million ways to spend that cash. yes, we need better transportation here, but it is beginning to look like some kind of criminal mismanagement of funds is happening and pockets are get lined and nothing is getting accomplished. i | | | | |
| | | | think the whole matter should be thoroughly investigate by an independent group of knowledgeable citizens | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | maureen | carroll | ston sponding the manay | As noted in Table 5.3-1 of the DEIS, | | | |
| IN/G | maureen | Carron | | the revenue from the half-cent sales | | | |
| | | | | tax in Durham County for public | | | |
| | | | has it been used for | transportation is not being used | | | |
| | | | anything? | solely to fund light rail project | | | |
| | | | anyunng: | development. Revenue from the | | | |
| | | | | half-cent sales tax has already been | | | |
| | | | | used to implement near term | | | |
| | | | | • | | | |
| | | | | improvements to DATA bus | | | |
| | | | | services. In addition, the sales tax | | | |
| | | | | will be used to support the design | | | |
| | | | | and construction of a Neighborhood | | | |
| | | | | Transit Center at The Village | | | |
| | | | | Shopping Center near the | | | |
| | | | | intersection of Raynor Street and | | | |
| | | | | Miami Boulevard, a location in east | | | |
| | | | | Durham that has the second-highest | | | |
| | | | | level of bus boardings in Durham | | | |
| | | | | after Durham Station. In | | | |
| | | | | coordination with the City of | | | |
| | | | | Durham, revenue from the half-cent sales tax will also be used to make | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | improvements to bus stops and | | | |
| | | | | pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure | | | |
| | | | | along a Transit Emphasis Corridor | | | |
| | | | | where DATA routes 3 and 16 run | | | |
| | | | | through the city, including east | | | |
| | | | | Durham. | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 116 | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Tami | Carter | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|
| Mr. | David | Carter | This light rail fiasco was shoved down the voters throats. It's not feasible or sustainable without punishing the citizens further. Why not use existing rail lines with a LOT less money? | Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. The existing freight rail tracks are currently being utilized for freight rail purposes. | | | |
| | Mary | Carter | N/G | | | | |
| - | David | Carter | N/G | | | | |
| | Jennifer | Cayless | N/G | | | | |
| | Hugh | Cayless | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Brian | Chacos | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Mr | Ryan | Chamberlain | Highway noise is already | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or | | In general, light rail transit is a | |
| | | | unbearable. Light | eliminate pedestrian and motorist | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | very safe mode of transportation. | |
| | | | l' ' | conflicts with transit vehicles. | , | Per FTA's 2009 Rail Safety | |
| | | | the atmosphere. Too | Detailed information regarding the | network and any measures | Statistics Report available on the | |
| | | | much EXPENSE and not | roadways, sidewalks, and trails | recommended to mitigate such | site referenced above, crash rates | |
| | | | enough SENSE to connect | expected to be affected by the | impacts. Technical reports that | for rail transit in the US ranged | |
| | | | this train to areas where | proposed D-O LRT Project is | report the results of traffic | from 2.16 accidents per 100 | |
| | | | people NEED mass | provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS | simulations are included as | million Passenger Miles to 5.35 | |
| | | | transit who in | section 3.6, and the Basis for | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | accidents per 100 million | |
| | | | Meadowmont would | Engineering Design (appendix L). | DEIS. | Passenger Miles for the six-year | |
| | | | need to ride a train due to | To avoid the potential for incidents | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | study period in that report. For | |
| | | | low- income? At-grade | at -grade intersections, crossings | proposed mitigation measures | comparison, statistics on motor | |
| | | | crossings are probably the | would be signalized or equipped | that are planned to mitigate for | vehicle crash rates are available | |
| | | | worst part of all of this in | with gates with bells to warn of | project-related roadway effects. | from NCDOT at the following link: | |
| | | | this area. A huge reason | oncoming trains. The trains will also | These effects are summarized in | https://connect.ncdot.gov/resour | |
| | | | trains on this entire coast | have bells and horns. Bells, gates, | Table 3.2-3. In addition, as | ces/safety/pages/crash- | |
| | | | are problematic is | and horns would be activated | described in DEIS section 3.2.2, | data.aspx. | |
| | | | because of at- grade | according to Triangle Transit | there are numerous roadway | | |
| | | | crossings. Crossing | operating procedures and safety | project planned by the NCDOT in | | |
| | | | accidents, traffic backups, | guidelines. | the vicinity of the proposed D-O | | |
| | | | low train speeds; all of | | LRT Project. During Engineering, | | |
| | | | this is going to spell | | Triangle Transit will continue to | | |
| | | | disaster at these crossings | | coordinate with the NCDOT as | | |
| | | | especially. | | the designs of these projects | | |
| | | | | | advance. | | |
| | | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | |
| | | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | |
| | | | | | substantial modifications to the | | |
| | | | | | roadway are incorporated into | | |
| | | | | | the design including additional | | |
| | | | | | turn bays and restriping of | | |
| N/G | Allison | Chandler | N/G | | , , | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-------------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Suzanne and | Chaney | We have free buses in | o o | The D-O LRT Project would | | |
| | Steve | | | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | benefit transit-dependent | | |
| | | | empty. Why does one | the year 2035. For more | populations by providing | | |
| | | | think they will ride a train | information about ridership please | increased mobility and improved | | |
| | | | that they have to pay for. | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | access and connectivity. The | | |
| | | | The low income | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | Light Rail Alternative would serve | | |
| | | | individuals don't have the | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | as a spine to link the residential | | |
| | | | money to pay for a train | and Results Report. As noted in the | growth with new employment | | |
| | | | ticket. | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | opportunities in the D-O | | |
| | | | The majority of people | region's existing transit network is | Corridor. A discussion of | | |
| | | | have their own cars and | currently operating at close to | potential impacts to minority and | | |
| | | | are not going to give up | maximum capacity including 84 | low-income populations is | | |
| | | | their time (the train | buses per hour servicing UNC | provided in detail in DEIS chapter | | |
| | | | transit time is long than it | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | 5. | | |
| | | | takes to drive from | servicing Duke University and | As listed in Table 4.2-4, the | | |
| | | | Chapel Hill to Durham) | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | proposed station areas of the | | |
| | | | nor their freedom they | Medical Centers. As further detailed | NEPA Preferred Alternative | | |
| | | | enjoy with their carthey | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | would serve approximately | | |
| | | | go and come on their own | this combination of bus routes that | 53,000 residents, 25,800 | | |
| | | | schedule not the train | currently serve the D-O Corridor | households, and employment of | | |
| | | | schedule. They have | and provide a high level of transit | 119,100, in 2040. The NEPA | | |
| | | | transportation when they | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | Preferred Alternative would also | | |
| | | | get to Durham. They | there are portions of the corridor | serve over 13,000 transit | | |
| | | | don't have to find a way | within Chapel Hill and between | dependent persons living within | | |
| | | | to get from the Durham | Duke and downtown Durham | 1/2-mile of the stations, as well as | | |
| | | | train station to their | where, due to congestion, adding | a LEP population of over 2,600. | | |
| | | | destination. If they drive | additional buses will not improve | | | |
| | | | their car, they can drive | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | | |
| | | | destination. | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | | |
| Mrs | Pal | Cheema | N/G | | | | |
| D : | 3·1. · | Cl. | N/C | | | | |
| Dr | Zibin | Chen | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|--|---|------------|------------|
| Title Dr | FirstName Dawn | Last Name Chin-Quee | I live in the area of Farrington and already have problems with traffic getting to I-40 and 54 from Farrington. Also, I don't want the value of my condo to be | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the | Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved | | Response 4 |
| | | | | l '' ' ' ' | premiums of 3%-40% were | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| N/G | Kathleen | Christian | This train is massively | Various transit technologies were | Section 4.4.3.1 states that for | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce | Annual operating and |
| | | | expensive to build and | previously studied and evaluated in | visual impacts Triangle Transit | or eliminate pedestrian and | maintenance costs will be paid for |
| | | | will drain funds from | an extensive public process called | will use interdisciplinary design | motorist conflicts with transit | with revenue from fares as well as |
| | | | future transit needs with | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | teams to create aesthetics | vehicles. | local tax dollars, including sales |
| | | | operation and | Technologies considered during the | guidelines and stands in the | Detailed information regarding | tax revenue generated in Durham |
| | | | maintenance costs over | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, | design of project element s and | the roadways, sidewalks, and | and Orange counties, funding |
| | | | 16 million per year. It | Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), | provide landscaping and | trails expected to be affected by | from North Carolina Department |
| | | | harms multiple | and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | aesthetic treatments with in | the proposed D-O LRT Project is | of Transportation (NCDOT), and |
| | | | neighborhoods that its | Through the Alternatives Analysis, | close proximity to residences. | provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS | other local fees and taxes. |
| | | | tracks border, both by | light rail was selected as the best | | section 3.6, and the Basis for | |
| | | | destroying air-cleaning, | transit technology option to best | | Engineering Design (appendix L). | |
| | | | sound-buffering trees and | serve the Durham-Orange Corridor | | To avoid the potential for | |
| | | | by creating unsafe at- | and to meet the Purpose and Need | | incidents at -grade intersections, | |
| | | | grade train-auto | of the proposed transit project. The | | crossings would be signalized or | |
| | | | intersections. The results | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | | equipped with gates with bells to | |
| | | | are higher air pollution, | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | | warn of oncoming trains. The | |
| | | | increased sound pollution | The Alternatives Analysis is available | | trains will also have bells and | |
| | | | from nearby highways | on ourtransitfuture.com. | | horns. Bells, gates, and horns | |
| | | | such as Rt 54 and I-40, | | | would be activated according to | |
| | | | and dangerous, traffic | | | Triangle Transit operating | |
| | | | bottlenecks at the car- | | | procedures and safety guidelines. | |
| | | | train intersections. All this | | | | |
| | | | to decrease the need for | | | | |
| | | | bus service at Duke and | | | | |
| | | | UNC medical centers, | | | | |
| | | | which could be optimized | | | | |
| | | | with bus- only lanes for | | | | |
| | | | the last mile near these | | | | |
| | | | busy centers - for possibly | | | | |
| | | | a BILLION less dollars! | | | | |
| | | | Without hurting so many | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|--|---|---|------------|
| Mrs. | Kathleen | Cimo | Creek and will without a doubt adversely affect the neighborhood and its property values. Further, it will increase congestion on the already- congested Route 54E, which will cause traffic to backup into Downing Creek. | Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail. | proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into | eastbound NC 54 is located approximately 4,500 feet to the east at Falconbridge Road and should not impact vehicles exiting from Downing Creek Parkway or Littlejohn Road. The northbound Littlejohn Road left turn to westbound NC 54 currently has very limited usage with less than 10 vehicles per hour performing this maneuver in both the AM and PM peak hours. Downing Creek Parkway is configured today as an eastbound NC 54 right turn to southbound Downing Creek Parkway and a | |
| Mr | Brent | Clark | N/G | | turn bays and restriping of | controlled right turns do not | |
| | Cindy | Clark | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Brent | Clark | N/G | | | | |
| | | CLAYTON | STOP THE LIGHT RAIL AND SUBSTATION!!! | Comment Noted | | | |
| N/G | David | Cocchetto | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Ms | maria | coleman | This is portially what | The Town of Chapel Hill requested | | | |
| IVIS | mana | coleman | This is partially what Meadowmont was | that alternatives to the C1 | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | designed for, and that | alignments be studied as part of the | | | |
| | | | would be the perfect | Alternatives Analysis for the Project. | | | |
| | | | place just as originally | As a result, the Project team | | | |
| | | | layer out. | developed the C2 alignments as part | | | |
| | | | | of the Alternatives Analysis. In | | | |
| | | | | February 2012, the Durham-Chapel | | | |
| | | | | Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning | | | |
| | | | | Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted | | | |
| | | | | the proposed D-O LRT Project, | | | |
| | | | | including both the C1 and C2 | | | |
| | | | | alignment corridors. | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | The Town of Chapel Hill expressed | | | |
| | | | | its preference for an alignment | | | |
| | | | | running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A | | | |
| | | | | Alternatives) that would be more | | | |
| | | | | supportive of planned future | | | |
| | | | | growth than C1 and C1A | | | |
| | | | | Alternatives. These alternatives | | | |
| | | | | would result in a conversion of less | | | |
| | | | | dense land uses into higher density | | | |
| | | | | uses near stations. These impacts | | | |
| | | | | are considered beneficial and | | | |
| | | | | consistent with local planning. | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | The C1 Alternative would impact | | | |
| | | | | undisturbed natural areas including | | | |
| | | | | the Little Creek Bottomlands and | | | |
| | | | | Slopes Significant Natural Heritage | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|--|---|--|------------|
| N/G | Rodalyn | Coleman | a location for Rail Operations and Maintenance Facility. My home is located directly across the street and the maintenance facility poses both a major health risk, as well as a traffic problem. My tax dollars should be spent on | track which accommodates cross- overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative also has the | impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: | |
| N/G | Rodalyn | Coleman | I strongly oppose the Go Triangle Lite Rail because the cost hits me as a tax payer on the Federal, state and local levels and will continue to take my retirement and use in wasteful spending to keep up with the deteriorating conditions of the lite rail. | lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives Comment Noted | turn bays and restriping of | the University of North Carolina | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|----------|--------------|-----------------|--|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Mr | Ron | Coltrane | I'm afraid the development of the land will decrease property values in the Downing Creek and Meadowmont area where I own. | Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail. | | | |
| mr Mr | john Paul | conklin Coon | No light rail PLEASR N/G | Comment Noted | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|---|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Paul | Coon | plan with the growth trends in the region. | Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. | | | |
| ms. | Wallis | Cooper | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Dr. | Rand | Cork | Light rail is trying to fill a | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | | | |
| | | | need that doesn't exist - | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | | | |
| | | | waste of money & threat | the year 2035. For more | | | |
| | | | to our neighborhoods. | information about ridership please | | | |
| | | | | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | | | |
| | | | | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | | | |
| | | | | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | | | |
| | | | | and Results Report. As noted in the | | | |
| | | | | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | | | |
| | | | | region's existing transit network is | | | |
| | | | | currently operating at close to | | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | | |
| N/G | Belinda | Corpening | N/G | | | | |
| | John | Corpening | N/G | | | | |
| | Helen | Courvoisie | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Susan | Cowart | Delay this project for | Planning for high-capacity transit in | | | |
| 14/ 0 | Susan | Cowart | | the Triangle region began more | | | |
| | | | | than 20 years ago, and a number of | | | |
| | | | Durham and Orange | studies have been conducted to | | | |
| | | | Counties with Wake | advance major transit investments | | | |
| | | | County. | in the area, including extensive | | | |
| | | | County. | coordination with stakeholders and | | | |
| | | | | members of the public to develop, | | | |
| | | | | evaluate, and refine the range of | | | |
| | | | | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | | | |
| | | | | studies, white papers, and reports | | | |
| | | | | that identified the need for high- | | | |
| | | | | capacity transit in the region and | | | |
| | | | | defined the D-O Corridor are | | | |
| | | | | summarized in Section 2.1. These | | | |
| | | | | past studies indicate that the | | | |
| | | | | estimated demand for a | | | |
| | | | | continuously connected rail line to | | | |
| | | | | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | | | |
| | | | | cost effective for the Project. | | | |
| | | | | RTP has a significant number of | | | |
| | | | | jobs, but they are widely distributed | | | |
| | | | | and dispersed compared to Chapel | | | |
| | | | | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | | | |
| | | | | development pattern is not as | | | |
| | | | | conducive to rail. | | | |
| | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | | | |
| | | | | currently evaluating future potential | | | |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be | | | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is | | | |
| | | | | secured for transit in Wake County. | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Dr. | Doug | Cowart | WE must delay this | _ | Planning for high-capacity transit | | As noted in the Executive |
| | | | 1 7 | l' - | in the Triangle region began | experienced extraordinary | Summary (ES-5), the region's |
| | | | | an extensive public process called | more than 20 years ago, and a | growth in recent years. Growth | existing transit network is |
| | | | solution that will connect | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | number of studies have been | forecasts show population in the | currently operating at close to |
| | | | Durham and Orange | Technologies considered during the | conducted to advance major | region increasing by 80 percent | maximum capacity including 84 |
| | | | Counties with Wake | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, | transit investments in the area, | between 2010 and 2040, from | buses per hour servicing UNC |
| | | | County.A single line | Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), | including extensive coordination | 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour |
| | | | through low density areas | and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | with stakeholders and members | Corridor, the population is | servicing Duke University and |
| | | | is a BAD idea. There is | Through the Alternatives Analysis, | of the public to develop, | projected to double and the | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) |
| | | | simply no evidence that | light rail was selected as the best | evaluate, and refine the range of | highest expected travel intensity | Medical Centers. As further |
| | | | this light rail is needed at | transit technology option to best | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The | (number of trips per acre) in the | detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of |
| | | | this time. Transit needs | serve the Durham-Orange Corridor | key studies, white papers, and | Triangle region is predominately | the Purpose and Need, this |
| | | | are better served in a | and to meet the Purpose and Need | reports that identified the need | located in this corridor. | combination of bus routes that |
| | | | fiscally responsible | of the proposed transit project. The | for high-capacity transit in the | | currently serve the D-O Corridor |
| | | | manner by expansion of | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | region and defined the D-O | Even under current demands, the | and provide a high level of transit |
| | | | the bus services and | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | Corridor are summarized in | region's transportation system is | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, |
| | | | establish of bus lanes on | The Alternatives Analysis is available | Section 2.1. These past studies | beginning to strain. Levels of | there are portions of the corridor |
| | | | surface highways. The | on ourtransitfuture.com. | indicate that the estimated | congestion are increasing and are | within Chapel Hill and between |
| | | | costs and the proposed | | demand for a continuously | anticipated to worsen, which will | Duke and downtown Durham |
| | | | route are ill advised, and | | connected rail line to RDU and | lead to increased travel times and | where, due to congestion, adding |
| | | | do NOT address the | | RTP is not warranted or cost | the continuation of automobile- | additional buses will not improve |
| | | | needs of the population | | effective for the Project. | oriented development patterns. | service, as discussed further in |
| | | | growth area. The | | RTP has a significant number of | The region's explosive growth is | DEIS section 3.2. |
| | | | ultimate effect on taxes | | jobs, but they are widely | also outpacing the ability to | |
| | | | and the funding sources | | distributed and dispersed | repair, replace and expand the | |
| | | | are not clear. | | compared to Chapel Hill and | existing roadway network. | |
| | | | | | Durham. This dispersed | Considering financial and | |
| | | | | | development pattern is not as | environmental issues, simply | |
| | | | | | conducive to rail. | increasing highway capacity to | |
| | | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | meet these demands is no longer | |
| | | | | | currently evaluating future | a viable option (ES-5). | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | | -1 | | | | |
| N/G | Laura | Cox | There is no need for this | Planning for high-capacity transit in | | | |
| | | | stilted version of public | the Triangle region began more | | | |
| | | | transit which does not | than 20 years ago, and a number of | | | |
| | | | serve routes of greatest | studies have been conducted to | | | |
| | | | use such as the airport or | advance major transit investments | | | |
| | | | Wake County, whose | in the area, including extensive | | | |
| | | | residents were smart | coordination with stakeholders and | | | |
| | | | enough to stop this effort | members of the public to develop, | | | |
| | | | in its tracks. | evaluate, and refine the range of | | | |
| | | | | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | | | |
| | | | | studies, white papers, and reports | | | |
| | | | | that identified the need for high- | | | |
| | | | | capacity transit in the region and | | | |
| | | | | defined the D-O Corridor are | | | |
| | | | | summarized in Section 2.1. These | | | |
| | | | | past studies indicate that the | | | |
| | | | | estimated demand for a | | | |
| | | | | continuously connected rail line to | | | |
| | | | | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | | | |
| | | | | cost effective for the Project. | | | |
| | | | | RTP has a significant number of | | | |
| | | | | jobs, but they are widely distributed | | | |
| | | | | and dispersed compared to Chapel | | | |
| | | | | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | | | |
| | | | | development pattern is not as | | | |
| | | | | conducive to rail. | | | |
| | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | | | |
| | | | | currently evaluating future potential | | | |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be | | | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is | | | |
| | | | | secured for transit in Wake County. | | | |
| N/C | Huntor | Crandall | N/G | seed to transit in trake country. | | | |
| IV/G | Hunter | Cidiluali | ט/או | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| N/G | Claudia | Crassweller | Please stop this gross | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | Planning for high-capacity transit | As described in DEIS section 8.1 | |
| 14/ 0 | Ciaddia | Crassweller | ' - | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | in the Triangle region began | and further explained in DEIS | |
| | | | state tax dollars for a | the year 2035. For more | | chapter 1, the investment | |
| | | | poorly thought out plan | information about ridership please | , , | benefits of a project like the D-O | |
| | | | that reaches too few | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | conducted to advance major | LRT include: improved mobility, | |
| | | | | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | 1 | increased connectivity through | |
| | | | placing a burden on us | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | including extensive coordination | expanded transit options, and | |
| | | | and the people who live | and Results Report. As noted in the | _ | support of future development | |
| | | | in the affected areas in | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | | plans. Enhanced mobility will | |
| | | | the future. Billions of | , , , , , , | | 1. | |
| | | | | region's existing transit network is | | provide a competitive, reliable | |
| | | | dollars is not worth | currently operating at close to | , , | alternative to automobile use | |
| | | | throwing away for the | maximum capacity including 84 | l ' ' ' ' | that supports compact | |
| | | | very few people who will | buses per hour servicing UNC | reports that identified the need | development. | |
| | | | utilize this service. The | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | for high-capacity transit in the | | |
| | | | route is not logical or | servicing Duke University and | | Enhanced mobility will also | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | increase transit operating | |
| | | | being spent. Get an | Medical Centers. As further detailed | | efficiency: offer a competitive, | |
| | | | _ | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | indicate that the estimated | reliable transportation solution | |
| | | | this decision. If Wake | this combination of bus routes that | demand for a continuously | that will reduce travel time. | |
| | | | County opted out with | currently serve the D-O Corridor | | Increased connectivity will | |
| | | | their large population, | and provide a high level of transit | RTP is not warranted or cost | expand transit options between | |
| | | | how do you think it will | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | effective for the Project. | Durham and Chapel Hill by | |
| | | | work for much smaller | there are portions of the corridor | RTP has a significant number of | enhancing and seamlessly | |
| | | | counties. Stop this | within Chapel Hill and between | jobs, but they are widely | connecting with the existing | |
| | | | madness. | Duke and downtown Durham | distributed and dispersed | transit system. | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | compared to Chapel Hill and | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | Durham. This dispersed | In addition, increased | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | development pattern is not as | connectivity will serve major | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | conducive to rail. | activity and employment centers | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | The Wake County Transit Plan is | between Durham and Chapel Hill: | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | the University of North Carolina | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Peter | Crassweller | I am all for mass transit, | Planning for high-capacity transit in | As described in DEIS section 8.1 | | |
| , - | | | but for the amount of | the Triangle region began more | and further explained in DEIS | | |
| | | | money being used by this | than 20 years ago, and a number of | chapter 1, the investment | | |
| | | | plan is not justified. I | studies have been conducted to | benefits of a project like the D-O | | |
| | | | don't want the cost | advance major transit investments | LRT include: improved mobility, | | |
| | | | associated with this plan | in the area, including extensive | increased connectivity through | | |
| | | | to be sucking the money | coordination with stakeholders and | expanded transit options, and | | |
| | | | out of my wallet. This is | members of the public to develop, | support of future development | | |
| | | | crazy! Why doesn't this | evaluate, and refine the range of | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | |
| | | | involve transportation to | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | provide a competitive, reliable | | |
| | | | RTP, Southpoint, or the | studies, white papers, and reports | alternative to automobile use | | |
| | | | airport. Those would | that identified the need for high- | that supports compact | | |
| | | | increase the potential for | capacity transit in the region and | development. | | |
| | | | ridership. Our counties | defined the D-O Corridor are | | | |
| | | | are not large enough to | summarized in Section 2.1. These | Enhanced mobility will also | | |
| | | | support this kind of | past studies indicate that the | increase transit operating | | |
| | | | expensive system. Stop! | estimated demand for a | efficiency: offer a competitive, | | |
| | | | | continuously connected rail line to | reliable transportation solution | | |
| | | | | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | that will reduce travel time. | | |
| | | | | cost effective for the Project. | Increased connectivity will | | |
| | | | | RTP has a significant number of | expand transit options between | | |
| | | | | jobs, but they are widely distributed | Durham and Chapel Hill by | | |
| | | | | and dispersed compared to Chapel | enhancing and seamlessly | | |
| | | | | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | connecting with the existing | | |
| | | | | development pattern is not as | transit system. | | |
| | | | | conducive to rail. | | | |
| | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | In addition, increased | | |
| | | | | currently evaluating future potential | connectivity will serve major | | |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be | activity and employment centers | | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is | between Durham and Chapel Hill: | | |
| | | | | secured for transit in Wake County. | the University of North Carolina | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| ms | sheila | creth | This is an extraordinary | Planning for high-capacity transit in | GoTriangle forecasts an average | | |
| | | | , | | of 23,000 weekday light rail trips | | |
| | | | | | by the year 2035. For more | | |
| | | | ridership between UNC & | studies have been conducted to | information about ridership | | |
| | | | Duke universities. Why | advance major transit investments | please see DEIS Section 3.1: | | |
| | | | not consider a light rail | in the area, including extensive | Public Transportation and DEIS | | |
| | | | line to provide Chatham & | coordination with stakeholders and | Appendix K2: Travel Demand | | |
| | | | Orange county residents a | members of the public to develop, | Methodology and Results Report. | | |
| | | | fast way to get to areas of | evaluate, and refine the range of | As noted in the Executive | | |
| | | | Chapel Hill & Durham (not | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | Summary (ES-5), the region's | | |
| | | | just the universities). Or | studies, white papers, and reports | existing transit network is | | |
| | | | a light rain line from | that identified the need for high- | currently operating at close to | | |
| | | | Chatham to Raleigh | capacity transit in the region and | maximum capacity including 84 | | |
| | | | (parallel to I 40) with a | defined the D-O Corridor are | buses per hour servicing UNC | | |
| | | | Chapel Hill to Raleigh | summarized in Section 2.1. These | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | |
| | | | include the RT park! | past studies indicate that the | servicing Duke University and | | |
| | | | Now that's lots of people. | estimated demand for a | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | |
| | | | | continuously connected rail line to | Medical Centers. As further | | |
| | | | | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose | | |
| | | | | cost effective for the Project. | and Need, this combination of | | |
| | | | | RTP has a significant number of | bus routes that currently serve | | |
| | | | | jobs, but they are widely distributed | the D-O Corridor and provide a | | |
| | | | | and dispersed compared to Chapel | high level of transit service | | |
| | | | | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | (Figure 1.5-2). However, there | | |
| | | | | development pattern is not as | are portions of the corridor | | |
| | | | | conducive to rail. | within Chapel Hill and between | | |
| | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | Duke and downtown Durham | | |
| | | | | currently evaluating future potential | where, due to congestion, adding | | |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be | additional buses will not improve | | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is | service, as discussed further in | | |
| | | | | secured for transit in Wake County. | DEIS section 3.2. | | |
| Ms | Caroline | Crocker | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Charles | Crocker | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Henrietta | Croom | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|---------------|-----------|-----------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|------------|
| N/G | Lorna Lynn | Culton | I don't support the | Various transit technologies were | Even under current demands, the | As noted in the Executive | |
| 14/ 0 | LOTTIA LYTITI | Cuiton | proposed rail. Stats on | previously studied and evaluated in | region's transportation system is | | |
| | | | systems in other areas | an extensive public process called | , , | existing transit network is | |
| | | | (larger than Durham and | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | congestion are increasing and are | | |
| | | | Chapel Hill) indicate that | Technologies considered during the | | , , , | |
| | | | rails become a financial | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, | | buses per hour servicing UNC | |
| | | | burden to taxpayers and | Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | |
| | | | ticket prices bring in less | and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | | servicing Duke University and | |
| | | | than 1/4 the operating | Through the Alternatives Analysis, | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | |
| | | | cost. I would rather see | light rail was selected as the best | | Medical Centers. As further | |
| | | | | transit technology option to best | | detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of | |
| | | | towards upgrading the | 0, 1 | | the Purpose and Need, this | |
| | | | | serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need | | combination of bus routes that | |
| | | | would give riders more | of the proposed transit project. The | , , | currently serve the D-O Corridor | |
| | | | destinations and be | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | | and provide a high level of transit | |
| | | | | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | |
| | | | • | | | | |
| | | | _ | The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | | there are portions of the corridor | |
| | | | comparison to the | on ourtransitiuture.com. | 5). | within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham | |
| | | | functionality of an | | | | |
| | | | upgraded commuter bus | | · · | where, due to congestion, adding | |
| | | | system and not worth the | | | additional buses will not improve | |
| | | | money! I would like to | | Transit increased bus ridership by | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| | | | see dedicated lanes for | | ' | DEIS section 3.2. | |
| | | | busses with | | more than a million additional | Le condende ou state to the bish | |
| | | | enhancements made to | | | In order to maintain the high | |
| | | | the bus stops (like at the | | | quality of life and attract new | |
| | | | airport) and to the busses | | | residents and businesses, the | |
| | | | (offering WiFi and more | | Corridor, it is becoming difficult | region needs a multi-modal | |
| | | | comfortable seating as | | to maintain schedule adherence | transportation system, including | |
| | | | airport shuttles). I | | • | improved high-quality transit | |
| | | | visualize commuters | | tor bus routes in the corridor. On- | service. The D-O Corridor needs a | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Gail | Culton | Waste of our tax money. | Even under current demands, the | | | |
| | | | Improve bus service like | region's transportation system is | | | |
| | | | our neighbors in Raleigh | beginning to strain. Levels of | | | |
| | | | instead. | congestion are increasing and are | | | |
| | | | | anticipated to worsen, which will | | | |
| | | | | lead to increased travel times and | | | |
| | | | | the continuation of automobile- | | | |
| | | | | oriented development patterns. The | | | |
| | | | | region's explosive growth is also | | | |
| | | | | outpacing the ability to repair, | | | |
| | | | | replace and expand the existing | | | |
| | | | | roadway network. Considering | | | |
| | | | | financial and environmental issues, | | | |
| | | | | simply increasing highway capacity | | | |
| | | | | to meet these demands is no longer | | | |
| | | | | a viable option (ES-5). | | | |
| | | | | As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over | | | |
| | | | | the past 10 years, Triangle Transit | | | |
| | | | | increased bus ridership by more | | | |
| | | | | than 140 percent adding more than | | | |
| | | | | a million additional trips from 2005 | | | |
| | | | | to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the | | | |
| | | | | growing levels of congestion within | | | |
| | | | | the D-O Corridor, it is becoming | | | |
| | | | | difficult to maintain schedule | | | |
| | | | | adherence and consistency in travel | | | |
| | | | | times for bus routes in the corridor. | | | |
| | | | | On-time performance for weekday | | | |
| | | | | regional routes operating within the | | | |
| | | | | D-O Corridor is equal to or worse | | | |
| N/G | Patrick | Culton | N/G | | | | |
| | Donna | Culton | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| /0 | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Lynda | Cunningham | Choose the "NO Build" | Various transit technologies were | While RTP has a significant | | |
| | | | Alternative and build as | previously studied and evaluated in | number of jobs, they are widely | | |
| | | | Bus Rapid Transit system | an extensive public process called | distributed and dispersed | | |
| | | | that can be integrated | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | compared to Chapel Hill and | | |
| | | | into Wake County's plan | Technologies considered during the | Durham. This dispersed | | |
| | | | for BRT. Then there will | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, | development pattern is not as | | |
| | | | be public transportation | Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), | conducive to rail. | | |
| | | | to RTP. Light Rail is too | and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | The Wake County Transit Plan is | | |
| | | | expensive, and the | Through the Alternatives Analysis, | currently evaluating future | | |
| | | | technology is obsolete | light rail was selected as the best | potential transit corridors, which | | |
| | | | | transit technology option to best | could be studied if a funding | | |
| | | | | serve the Durham-Orange Corridor | source is secured for transit in | | |
| | | | | and to meet the Purpose and Need | Wake County. The Wake County | | |
| | | | | of the proposed transit project. The | | | |
| | | | | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | | | |
| | | | | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | | | |
| | | | | The Alternatives Analysis is available | | | |
| | | | | on ourtransitfuture.com. | | | |
| | | | | on our transitratar c.com. | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| N/G | Patrick | Curley | Originally concerned | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | _ | As stated in DEIS section 7.1, | |
| | | | about the routes | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | • | when the proposed D-O LRT | |
| | | | proposed and at grade | Project on the existing roadway | | Project is fully advanced through | |
| | | | | network and any measures | | the New Starts process, it is | |
| | | | • | recommended to mitigate such | 0 0 | anticipated that the New Starts | |
| | | | very concerned about | impacts. Technical reports that | | program will provide | |
| | | | financial viability and the | report the results of traffic | | approximately 50 percent of the | |
| | | | permanent subsidy Light | simulations are included as | | D-O LRT Project's capital cost. | |
| | | | Rail will require, and | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS | The non-New Starts costs will be | |
| | | | tremendous safety issues. | DEIS. | section 3.6, and the Basis for | covered by a combination of | |
| | | | We can do better with a | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | | funding sources, including sales | |
| | | | 1.8 Billion dollar budget. | proposed mitigation measures that | To avoid the potential for | tax revenue generated in Durham | |
| | | | | are planned to mitigate for project- | incidents at -grade intersections, | and Orange counties, funding | |
| | | | | related roadway effects. These | crossings would be signalized or | from North Carolina Department | |
| | | | | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | equipped with gates with bells to | of Transportation (NCDOT), and | |
| | | | | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | warn of oncoming trains. The | other local fees and taxes. | |
| | | | | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | trains will also have bells and | Triangle Transit will also pursue | |
| | | | | roadway project planned by the | horns. Bells, gates, and horns | Transportation Infrastructure | |
| | | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | would be activated according to | Finance and Innovation Act | |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | Triangle Transit operating | (TIFIA) credit assistance and | |
| | | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | procedures and safety guidelines. | possible alternative financing and | |
| | | | | continue to coordinate with the | | value capture options. | |
| | | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | | | |
| | | | | projects advance. | | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | | | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Mrs. | Wendy | Curtis | The placement of this rail | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | In general, the project is not | | |
| | , | | system will snarl | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | expected to have a significant | | |
| | | | | Project on the existing roadway | effect on traffic on those | | |
| | | | | network and any measures | roadways where it is close to D-O | | |
| | | | | recommended to mitigate such | LRT Project, nor always offer a | | |
| | | | | impacts. Technical reports that | faster travel time. However, the | | |
| | | | | report the results of traffic | D-O LRT Project will provide a | | |
| | | | | simulations are included as | competitive and reliable travel | | |
| | | | | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | alternative to the congestion on | | |
| | | | | DEIS. | these roadways, particularly | | |
| | | | | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | during the peak traffic hours and | | |
| | | | | proposed mitigation measures that | will provide improved travel time | | |
| | | | | are planned to mitigate for project- | reliability compared to bus | | |
| | | | | related roadway effects. These | transit services. | | |
| | | | | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | | | |
| | | | | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | | | |
| | | | | roadway project planned by the | | | |
| | | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | | | |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | | | |
| | | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | | | |
| | | | | continue to coordinate with the | | | |
| | | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | | | |
| | | | | projects advance. | | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | | | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Nan M. | Cushing | Small buses with wider | Various transit technologies were | Even under current demands, the | | |
| IV/ G | ivali ivi. | Cusining | routes could be more | previously studied and evaluated in | region's transportation system is | | |
| | | | conveient and less | an extensive public process called | beginning to strain. Levels of | | |
| | | | expensive. | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | congestion are increasing and are | | |
| | | | expensive. | Technologies considered during the | | | |
| | | | | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, | | | |
| | | | | Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), | and the continuation of | | |
| | | | | and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | automobile-oriented | | |
| | | | | Through the Alternatives Analysis, | development patterns. The | | |
| | | | | light rail was selected as the best | region's explosive growth is also | | |
| | | | | transit technology option to best | outpacing the ability to repair, | | |
| | | | | serve the Durham-Orange Corridor | replace and expand the existing | | |
| | | | | and to meet the Purpose and Need | roadway network. Considering | | |
| | | | | of the proposed transit project. The | , | | |
| | | | | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | | | |
| | | | | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | | | |
| | | | | The Alternatives Analysis is available | | | |
| | | | | on ourtransitfuture.com. | | | |
| | | | | on ourtransitiuture.com. | [5). | | |
| | | | | | As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, | | |
| | | | | | over the past 10 years, Triangle | | |
| | | | | | Transit increased bus ridership by | | |
| | | | | | more than 140 percent adding | | |
| | | | | | more than a million additional | | |
| | | | | | trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure | | |
| | | | | | 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels | | |
| | | | | | of congestion within the D-O | | |
| | | | | | Corridor, it is becoming difficult | | |
| | | | | | to maintain schedule adherence | | |
| | | | | | and consistency in travel times | | |
| | | | | | for bus routes in the corridor. On- | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|------------|-----------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Katherine | Dancel | Meadowmont was | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | The Town of Chapel Hill | | |
| 14/ 0 | Katrierine | Dancer | designed with the Light | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | requested that alternatives to | | |
| | | | Rail in mind. The | Project on the existing roadway | the C1 alignments be studied as | | |
| | | | | network and any measures | part of the Alternatives Analysis | | |
| | | | • | recommended to mitigate such | for the Project. As a result, the | | |
| | | | already extremely | impacts. Technical reports that | Project team developed the C2 | | |
| | | | congested. Please | report the results of traffic | alignments as part of the | | |
| | | | reconsider! | simulations are included as | Alternatives Analysis. In February | | |
| | | | reconsider: | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill- | | |
| | | | | DEIS. | Carrboro Metropolitan Planning | | |
| | | | | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | Organization (DCHC MPO) | | |
| | | | | proposed mitigation measures that | adopted the proposed D-O LRT | | |
| | | | | are planned to mitigate for project- | Project, including both the C1 | | |
| | | | | related roadway effects. These | and C2 alignment corridors. | | |
| | | | | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | and C2 diigninent cornuors. | | |
| | | | | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | The Town of Chapel Hill | | |
| | | | | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | expressed its preference for an | | |
| | | | | roadway project planned by the | alignment running south of NC | | |
| | | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that | | |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | would be more supportive of | | |
| | | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | planned future growth than C1 | | |
| | | | | continue to coordinate with the | and C1A Alternatives. These | | |
| | | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | alternatives would result in a | | |
| | | | | projects advance. | conversion of less dense land | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | uses into higher density uses | | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | near stations. These impacts are | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | considered beneficial and | | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | consistent with local planning. | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | The second second planning. | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | The C1 Alternative would impact | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | undisturbed natural areas | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | anaistarbea natarararareas | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|------------|-----------|-------------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|
| N/G | Karima and | Das | NO to the | Various transit technologies were | Even under current demands, the | | |
| IN/ G | Shiva | Das | | previously studied and evaluated in | region's transportation system is | | |
| | Siliva | | rail train! Makes no | an extensive public process called | beginning to strain. Levels of | | |
| | | | | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | congestion are increasing and are | | |
| | | | _ | Technologies considered during the | | | |
| | | | , , | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, | · ' | | |
| | | | | Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), | and the continuation of | | |
| | | | passengers. It would | and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | automobile-oriented | | |
| | | | make more sense to fill | Through the Alternatives Analysis, | | | |
| | | | these hybrid buses first | light rail was selected as the best | development patterns. The region's explosive growth is also | | |
| | | | · · | | | | |
| | | | before even thinking of | transit technology option to best | outpacing the ability to repair, | | |
| | | | embarking on this very | serve the Durham-Orange Corridor | replace and expand the existing | | |
| | | | 1 ' ' ' | and to meet the Purpose and Need | roadway network. Considering | | |
| | | | and all of its ramifications. | of the proposed transit project. The | financial and environmental | | |
| | | | | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | | | |
| | | | | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | ' ' | | |
| | | | | The Alternatives Analysis is available | | | |
| | | | | on ourtransitfuture.com. | [5). | | |
| | | | | | As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, | | |
| | | | | | over the past 10 years, Triangle | | |
| | | | | | Transit increased bus ridership by | | |
| | | | | | more than 140 percent adding | | |
| | | | | | more than a million additional | | |
| | | | | | trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure | | |
| | | | | | 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels | | |
| | | | | | of congestion within the D-O | | |
| | | | | | Corridor, it is becoming difficult | | |
| | | | | | to maintain schedule adherence | | |
| | | | | | and consistency in travel times | | |
| | | | | | for bus routes in the corridor. On- | | |

| rstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|---------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| atricia | Davisa | Highway E4 is already | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | | | |
| atricia | Daves | Highway 54 is already | | | | |
| | | - | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | | | |
| | | think the Light Rail Train | Project on the existing roadway | | | |
| | | should be built thus | network and any measures | | | |
| | | adding to the congestion. | recommended to mitigate such | | | |
| | | | impacts. Technical reports that | | | |
| | | | report the results of traffic | | | |
| | | | simulations are included as | | | |
| | | | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | | | |
| | | | DEIS. | | | |
| | | | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | | | |
| | | | proposed mitigation measures that | | | |
| | | | are planned to mitigate for project- | | | |
| | | | related roadway effects. These | | | |
| | | | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | | | |
| | | | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | | | |
| | | | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | | | |
| | | | roadway project planned by the | | | |
| | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | | | |
| | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | | | |
| | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | | | |
| | | | continue to coordinate with the | | | |
| | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | | | |
| | | | projects advance. | | | |
| | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | | |
| | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | | |
| | | | substantial modifications to the | | | |
| | | | roadway are incorporated into the | | | |
| | | | design including additional turn | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| athryn | Davis | N/G | - p.p | | | |
| athryn | | Davis | Davis N/G | bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate | bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate | bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Nancy W | Davis | The light rail as presently | Various transit technologies were | Even under current demands, the | | |
| , - | | | proposed does not make | previously studied and evaluated in | region's transportation system is | | |
| | | | sense. At the speeds | an extensive public process called | beginning to strain. Levels of | | |
| | | | proposed, bus | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | congestion are increasing and are | | |
| | | | transportation works | Technologies considered during the | anticipated to worsen, which will | | |
| | | | without disrupting | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, | lead to increased travel times | | |
| | | | neighborhoods. | Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), | and the continuation of | | |
| | | | | and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | automobile-oriented | | |
| | | | | Through the Alternatives Analysis, | development patterns. The | | |
| | | | | light rail was selected as the best | region's explosive growth is also | | |
| | | | | transit technology option to best | outpacing the ability to repair, | | |
| | | | | serve the Durham-Orange Corridor | replace and expand the existing | | |
| | | | | and to meet the Purpose and Need | roadway network. Considering | | |
| | | | | of the proposed transit project. The | financial and environmental | | |
| | | | | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | issues, simply increasing highway | | |
| | | | | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | capacity to meet these demands | | |
| | | | | The Alternatives Analysis is available | is no longer a viable option (ES- | | |
| | | | | on ourtransitfuture.com. | 5). | | |
| | | | | | As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, | | |
| | | | | | over the past 10 years, Triangle | | |
| | | | | | Transit increased bus ridership by | | |
| | | | | | more than 140 percent adding | | |
| | | | | | more than a million additional | | |
| | | | | | trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure | | |
| | | | | | 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels | | |
| | | | | | of congestion within the D-O | | |
| | | | | | Corridor, it is becoming difficult | | |
| | | | | | to maintain schedule adherence | | |
| | | | | | and consistency in travel times | | |
| | | | | | for bus routes in the corridor. On- | | |
| N/G | M. | de Bruyn | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| DR | Ellen | De Flora | The proposed light rail | In general, the project is not | As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 | In summary, the Farrington Road | |
| | | | system for the Durham | expected to have a significant effect | and 8.2.2.1, construction of the | ROMF Alternative site is the most | |
| | | | Chapel Hill area will hurt | on traffic on those roadways where | ROMF at the Farrington Road site | desirable from a construction and | |
| | | | communities and not help | it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor | will require land use entitlements | operations standpoint. It is a 25- | |
| | | | alleviate the congestion | always offer a faster travel time. | including a comprehensive plan | acre site, the largest site of the | |
| | | | of the area. The ROMF | However, the D-O LRT Project will | amendment and rezoning. | alternatives considered. The | |
| | | | are placed in areas not | provide a competitive and reliable | It is expected that the City and/or | Farrington Road ROMF site is | |
| | | | designated for industrial | travel alternative to the congestion | County of Durham will place | located on a long straight section | |
| | | | use and will dirty up areas | on these roadways, particularly | conditions on the approvals that | of track which accommodates | |
| | | | that were meant for | during the peak traffic hours. | appropriate mitigation measures | cross-overs for access to the | |
| | | | communities, small | | are included in the design, | yard. The site is reasonably flat, | |
| | | | businesses and schools. | | including strategies to | making preparation of the site for | |
| | | | Other more flexible and | | complement the surrounding | construction easier. Effective | |
| | | | cost effective alternatives | | context such as use of | screening buffers can be | |
| | | | should be sought. | | architectural styles and/or | provided around the site. The | |
| | | | | | landscape design. | largest land owner on the site has | |
| | | | | | During Engineering, Triangle | expressed support for the | |
| | | | | | Transit will continue to | Farrington Road ROMF | |
| | | | | | coordinate with property owners | Alternative. The site would have | |
| | | | | | and residents near the site to | no effects to historic resources. | |
| | | | | | develop and refine these | The Farrington Road ROMF | |
| | | | | | strategies. The public will also | Alternative also has the lowest | |
| | | | | | have the opportunity to | cost of all ROMF alternatives | |
| | | | | | comment on the design through | considered. | |
| | | | | | a public hearing as part of the | | |
| | | | | | City and/or County approval | | |
| | | | | | process. | | |
| | | | | | As described in DEIS section | | |
| | | | | | 4.10.4, no noise impacts are | | |
| | | | | | anticipated at the Farrington | | |
| | | | | | ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states | | |
| Ms | Allison | Deal | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|---|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Trish | Dean | Decision making about the location of stations, atgrade crossings and ROMF seem very narrowminded and not keeping in mind the new reality this will create for the people who live and travel in those areas. | land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with | ,, | | |
| N/G | Heath | Dedmond | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Molly | Dempsey | N/G | | | | |
| Mrs. | Kathleen | Dennis | N/G | | | | |
| Title | FirstName | Surname | Comment | | | | |
| mr. | Luther | Dennis | N/G | | | | |
| Ms. | Ashley | DeSena | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Nancy | Dewhirst | N/G | | | | |
| Dr | Mark | Dewhirst | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Ms. | Barbara | Dickinson | | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | | In summary, the Farrington Road | |
| | | | placement of the Light | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | and 8.2.2.1, construction of the | ROMF Alternative site is the most | |
| | | | Rail maintenance facility | Project on the existing roadway | <u> </u> | desirable from a construction and | |
| | | | being placed in the | network and any measures | will require land use entitlements | operations standpoint. It is a 25- | |
| | | | peaceful, heavily- | recommended to mitigate such | including a comprehensive plan | acre site, the largest site of the | |
| | | | residential area on | impacts. Technical reports that | amendment and rezoning. | alternatives considered. The | |
| | | | Farrington Road in | report the results of traffic | It is expected that the City and/or | Farrington Road ROMF site is | |
| | | | Durham and the | simulations are included as | County of Durham will place | located on a long straight section | |
| | | | passenger station in | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | conditions on the approvals that | of track which accommodates | |
| | | | Downing Creek in CHAPEL | DEIS. | appropriate mitigation measures | cross-overs for access to the | |
| | | | HILL. The placement of | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | are included in the design, | yard. The site is reasonably flat, | |
| | | | both facilities will create | proposed mitigation measures that | including strategies to | making preparation of the site for | |
| | | | tremendous traffic | are planned to mitigate for project- | complement the surrounding | construction easier. Effective | |
| | | | problems to already- | related roadway effects. These | context such as use of | screening buffers can be | |
| | | | existing overloaded traffic | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | architectural styles and/or | provided around the site. The | |
| | | | congestion, extensive | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | landscape design. | largest land owner on the site has | |
| | | | noise issues for peaceful | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | During Engineering, Triangle | expressed support for the | |
| | | | residential areas, and thel | roadway project planned by the | Transit will continue to | Farrington Road ROMF | |
| | | | decrease in property | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | coordinate with property owners | Alternative. The site would have | |
| | | | values for hundreds of | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | and residents near the site to | no effects to historic resources. | |
| | | | homes not to mention | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | develop and refine these | The Farrington Road ROMF | |
| | | | the eminent domain of | continue to coordinate with the | strategies. The public will also | Alternative also has the lowest | |
| | | | many decades-long | NCDOT as the designs of these | have the opportunity to | cost of all ROMF alternatives | |
| | | | residents. | projects advance. | comment on the design through | considered. | |
| | | | VOTE with a heart; listen | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | a public hearing as part of the | | |
| | | | to your constituents; | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | City and/or County approval | | |
| | | | place these two transit | substantial modifications to the | process. | | |
| | | | facilities in an industrial | roadway are incorporated into the | As described in DEIS section | | |
| | | | section on Cornwallis in | design including additional turn | 4.10.4, no noise impacts are | | |
| | | | Durham; that area is | bays and restriping of intersection | anticipated at the Farrington | | |
| | | | suited for such uses. | approaches to accommodate | ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|
| Dr. | Margie | Dietz | route has been so compromised at this point, it no longer serves the needs of the citizens of Durham. | GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and | | | |
| N/G | | DiGiovanni | I am concerned that the rail is cutting off access to the main roads for emergency vehicles and causing danger for residents of Downing Creek subdivision. | Section 4.12.4.6 states that Triangle Transit will coordinate with law enforcement, emergency and medical personnel, and other public agencies to investigate impacts of the light rail system on their day-to-day operations. | | | |
| | Anna | Dnegan | N/G | | | | |
| | Carol | Dodge | N/G | | | | |
| | Patricia | Dorsch | N/G | | | | |
| | Ernst | Dorsch | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | John | Dorward | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Mr. | James | Doughty | I am pro-transit and pro- | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | | | |
| | | | future. But this project | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | | | |
| | | | has been planned along | the year 2035. For more | | | |
| | | | illogical lines to serve | information about ridership please | | | |
| | | | | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | | | |
| | | | Our civil attempts to steer | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | | | |
| | | | it in a rational direction | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | | | |
| | | | were met with deaf ears. | and Results Report. As noted in the | | | |
| | | | Opposing the whole thing | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | | | |
| | | | is our only remaining | region's existing transit network is | | | |
| | | | option. I hope this course | currently operating at close to | | | |
| | | | of action is scrapped and | maximum capacity including 84 | | | |
| | | | that the Triangle starts | buses per hour servicing UNC | | | |
| | | | over to design a rail | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | | |
| | | | system that will actually | servicing Duke University and | | | |
| | | | serve people's needs. | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | | |
| Ms. | Donna | Douglas | N/G | | | | |
| Mr. | Michael | Douglas | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Danielle | Doyle | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Nancy | Drozd | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Edward | Drozd | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------|----------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Steven | Drysdale | Not in favor of the | Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the | | | |
| , - | | , | construction of the | evaluation of ROMF alternatives and | | | |
| | | | maintenance facility for | explains why the NEPA Preferred | | | |
| | | | light rail so close to our | Alternative was selected and why | | | |
| | | | neighborhood. | the other alternatives were | | | |
| | | | | eliminated from consideration. The | | | |
| | | | | Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is | | | |
| | | | | included in the NEPA Preferred | | | |
| | | | | Alternative. | | | |
| | | | | In summary, the Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative site is the most | | | |
| | | | | desirable from a construction and | | | |
| | | | | operations standpoint. It is a 25- | | | |
| | | | | acre site, the largest site of the | | | |
| | | | | alternatives considered. The | | | |
| | | | | Farrington Road ROMF site is | | | |
| | | | | located on a long straight section of | | | |
| | | | | track which accommodates cross- | | | |
| | | | | overs for access to the yard. The site | | | |
| | | | | is reasonably flat, making | | | |
| | | | | preparation of the site for | | | |
| | | | | construction easier. Effective | | | |
| | | | | screening buffers can be provided | | | |
| | | | | around the site. The largest land | | | |
| | | | | owner on the site has expressed | | | |
| | | | | support for the Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative. The site would | | | |
| | | | | have no effects to historic | | | |
| | | | | resources. The Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative also has the | | | |
| | | | | lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives | | | |
| N/G | Mary Jo | Dunnington | N/G | | | | |
| Mrs. | | Durham | N/G | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Beverly | Dyer | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|
| Mr | Sam | Dyer | 1. Costs: 1.05B to Durham | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or | GoTriangle forecasts an average | It is expected that the City and/or | |
| | | | according to the Durham | eliminate pedestrian and motorist | of 23,000 weekday light rail trips | County of Durham will place | |
| | | | County Bus and LRT plan. | conflicts with transit vehicles. | by the year 2035. For more | conditions on the approvals that | |
| | | | Read ODU State of the | Detailed information regarding the | information about ridership | appropriate mitigation measures | |
| | | | region report, | roadways, sidewalks, and trails | please see DEIS Section 3.1: | are included in the design, | |
| | | | construction delays and | expected to be affected by the | Public Transportation and DEIS | including strategies to | |
| | | | cost overruns are | proposed D-O LRT Project is | Appendix K2: Travel Demand | complement the surrounding | |
| | | | endemic with LRT const, | provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS | Methodology and Results Report. | context such as use of | |
| | | | according to the | section 3.6, and the Basis for | As noted in the Executive | architectural styles and/or | |
| | | | American J. of Planning, | Engineering Design (appendix L). | Summary (ES-5), the region's | landscape design. | |
| | | | costs are up to 40% | To avoid the potential for incidents | existing transit network is | During Engineering, Triangle | |
| | | | greater than estimates, | at -grade intersections, crossings | currently operating at close to | Transit will continue to | |
| | | | either miscalculating costs | would be signalized or equipped | maximum capacity including 84 | coordinate with property owners | |
| | | | or initial low ball from | with gates with bells to warn of | buses per hour servicing UNC | and residents near the site to | |
| | | | contractors to secure | oncoming trains. The trains will also | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | develop and refine these | |
| | | | contracts. | have bells and horns. Bells, gates, | servicing Duke University and | strategies. The public will also | |
| | | | 2. Safety: LRT death rate | and horns would be activated | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | have the opportunity to | |
| | | | (not counting suicide) 5- | according to Triangle Transit | Medical Centers. As further | comment on the design through | |
| | | | 10 times greater than bus- | operating procedures and safety | detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose | a public hearing as part of the | |
| | | | -source US DOT, nearly all | guidelines. | and Need, this combination of | City and/or County approval | |
| | | | are pedestrians at grade | | bus routes that currently serve | process. | |
| | | | crossings | | the D-O Corridor and provide a | As described in DEIS section | |
| | | | 3. Gentrification of east | | high level of transit service | 4.10.4, no noise impacts are | |
| | | | Durham: Multiple studies | | (Figure 1.5-2). However, there | anticipated at the Farrington | |
| | | | show this around Urban | | are portions of the corridor | ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states | |
| | | | LRT stations | | within Chapel Hill and between | lighting would be aimed towards | |
| | | | 4. Who is going to ride it: | | Duke and downtown Durham | the ROMF to reduce spillage onto | |
| | | | Read the 2011 city and | | where, due to congestion, adding | neighboring properties and | |
| | | | county issue guide from | | additional buses will not improve | adjacent roadways. In addition, | |
| | | | the John Locke | | service, as discussed further in | source-shielding would be used | |
| | | | Foundation. Very few | | DEIS section 3.2. | in exterior lighting at the ROMF. | |
| N/G | jeff | earley | N/G | | | | |
| | | Edwards | N/G | | | | |
| | larry | eimers | ridiculous waste of money | Comment Noted | | | |
| | | | with poor planning! | | | | |
| Mr | Peter | Einaudi | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Mary | Elkins | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-------------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Kathryn | Enchelmayer | don't understand why it cannot be on the other side of Hwy 54 from Downing Creek where | The location of the proposed Woodmont Station is located on the south side of NC 54 to support a significant portion of the Town of Chapel Hill's Future Focus area for growth along NC 54. Running the alignment along the north side of NC 54 and subsequently the placement of the Woodmont Station would not be supportive of the Town of Chapel Hill's growth policies. | | | |
| Capt | Peter | Enchelmayer | The concept of a train isworth consideration, however, locating the tracks across NC54 would not negatively affect our neighborhood as much as current plans. Rush hour egress/ingress would be f'd up severely were the current options selected. | Littlejohn Road and Downing Creek Parkway were not included in the original microsimulation traffic analysis as they are three-legged unsignalized intersections with turning volumes below 115 vehicles per hour for all movements from or to these roadways during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. The majority of volumes turning onto or exiting these roadways are below 60 vehicles per hour. The highest turning volumes at these locations are right turns that are stop controlled. These intersections do not meet the minimum volume conditions for a signal warrant, which would be required to install signals. The intersections will operate with the gates up or open Littlejohn Road and Downing Creek for 90% of the peak hours and this percentage will increase during offpeak hours when there are fewer trains. | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|---|---|---|---|
| | Thomas | Englund | This is a poor plan that will impact hundreds of homeowners in a very negative way. It will never pay off and will cost all area taxpayers an incredible amount of money so that very few can take a train to and from work every day. Go Triangle has been dishonest with the public, steadfastly adhering to their current proposal in a desperate effort to get the project underway. Please investigate further without relying on their numbers or projections. Please look into the stories of the families who will be displaced or otherwise damaged. Please investigate the environmental damage that will be caused by the | Triangle Transit has a robust public outreach approach for the D-O LRT Project, the details of which are included in Chapter 9. | As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to comment on the design through | Section 4.8.3.1 discusses groundwater quality and states that the 116 privately –owned wells that are within 1,500 feet of the D-O Corridor would not be affected by the operation of the | Cumulative stormwater runoff Anticipated cumulative impacts to water quality from the NEPA Preferred Alternatives, including the ROMF, would be additional impervious surface and modification of stream channels as a direct result of the project. These would combine with other new impervious surface area and modification of stream channels |
| Ms | Sharon | Epstein | that will be caused by the ROMF on Farrington Road. | | process. As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington | would have the indirect effect of generating regulated materials associated because of maintenance activities. These materials would include oils, greases, solvents, and other | |
| _ | Stanley | Epstein | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Ms | Carolyn | Epstein | This project is not good | Various transit technologies were | Even under current demands, the | As noted in the Executive | As described in DEIS section 8.1 |
| | | 1 | , , | previously studied and evaluated in | T | | and further explained in DEIS |
| | | | expensive, and benefits | l' | beginning to strain. Levels of | existing transit network is | chapter 1, the investment benefits |
| | | | too few to justify the | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | congestion are increasing and are | currently operating at close to | of a project like the D-O LRT |
| | | | huge expense. Lets | Technologies considered during the | anticipated to worsen, which will | maximum capacity including 84 | include: improved mobility, |
| | | | expand the bus service at | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, | lead to increased travel times | buses per hour servicing UNC | increased connectivity through |
| | | | very much less expense. | Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), | and the continuation of | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | expanded transit options, and |
| | | | | and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | automobile-oriented | servicing Duke University and | support of future development |
| | | | | Through the Alternatives Analysis, | development patterns. The | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | plans. Enhanced mobility will |
| | | | | light rail was selected as the best | region's explosive growth is also | Medical Centers. As further | provide a competitive, reliable |
| | | | | transit technology option to best | | detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of | alternative to automobile use that |
| | | | | serve the Durham-Orange Corridor | replace and expand the existing | the Purpose and Need, this | supports compact development. |
| | | | | · · | , | combination of bus routes that | |
| | | | | of the proposed transit project. The | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | Enhanced mobility will also |
| | | | | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | issues, simply increasing highway | and provide a high level of transit | increase transit operating |
| | | | | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | capacity to meet these demands | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | efficiency: offer a competitive, |
| | | | | The Alternatives Analysis is available | is no longer a viable option (ES- | there are portions of the corridor | reliable transportation solution |
| | | | | on ourtransitfuture.com. | 5). | within Chapel Hill and between | that will reduce travel time. |
| | | | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | Increased connectivity will expand |
| | | | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | |
| | | | | | over the past 10 years, Triangle | additional buses will not improve | and Chapel Hill by enhancing and |
| | | | | | Transit increased bus ridership by | | seamlessly connecting with the |
| | | | | | | DEIS section 3.2. | existing transit system. |
| | | | | | more than a million additional | | |
| | | | | | | In order to maintain the high | In addition, increased connectivity |
| | | | | | 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels | 1 | will serve major activity and |
| | | | | | of congestion within the D-O | residents and businesses, the | employment centers between |
| | | | | | Corridor, it is becoming difficult | region needs a multi-modal | Durham and Chapel Hill: the |
| | | | | | to maintain schedule adherence | transportation system, including | University of North Carolina at |
| | | | | | · | improved high-quality transit | Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, |
| | | | | | for bus routes in the corridor. On- | service. The D-O Corridor needs a | US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Ms | Susan | Erickson | Originally, RDU and RTP | | Various transit technologies were | - | |
| | | | were to be included as | the Triangle region began more | previously studied and evaluated | | |
| | | | part of the plan. After | than 20 years ago, and a number of | in an extensive public process | alternatives and explains why the | |
| | | | Wake County opted out, | studies have been conducted to | called the "Alternatives Analysis" | NEPA Preferred Alternative was | |
| | | | this was no longer | advance major transit investments | (AA). Technologies considered | selected and why the other | |
| | | | possible. The present | in the area, including extensive | during the AA included: | alternatives were eliminated | |
| | | | plan shows that the rail | coordination with stakeholders and | conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, | from consideration. The | |
| | | | line will originate at UNC | members of the public to develop, | Light Rail Transit (LRT), and | Farrington Road ROMF | |
| | | | Hospitals with stops at | evaluate, and refine the range of | Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | Alternative is included in the | |
| | | | DUMC and other | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | Through the Alternatives | NEPA Preferred Alternative. | |
| | | | locations on Hwy 54 and | studies, white papers, and reports | Analysis, light rail was selected as | In summary, the Farrington Road | |
| | | | 15-501. and end on | that identified the need for high- | the best transit technology | ROMF Alternative site is the most | |
| | | | Alston Ave near the | capacity transit in the region and | option to best serve the Durham- | desirable from a construction and | |
| | | | intersection with Hwy55. | defined the D-O Corridor are | Orange Corridor and to meet the | operations standpoint. It is a 25- | |
| | | | This will create traffic | summarized in Section 2.1. These | Purpose and Need of the | acre site, the largest site of the | |
| | | | nightmares on roads that | past studies indicate that the | proposed transit project. The | alternatives considered. The | |
| | | | are already congested | estimated demand for a | findings of the Alternatives | Farrington Road ROMF site is | |
| | | | with traffic, and disrupt | continuously connected rail line to | Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 | located on a long straight section | |
| | | | established | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | of the DEIS. The Alternatives | of track which accommodates | |
| | | | neighborhoods along the | cost effective for the Project. | Analysis is available on | cross-overs for access to the | |
| | | | route. There is already | RTP has a significant number of | ourtransitfuture.com. | yard. The site is reasonably flat, | |
| | | | dependable bus service | jobs, but they are widely distributed | | making preparation of the site for | |
| | | | which travels the same | and dispersed compared to Chapel | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | construction easier. Effective | |
| | | | route as the proposed | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | screening buffers can be | |
| | | | train. This train will cost | development pattern is not as | Project on the existing roadway | provided around the site. The | |
| | | | billions, and ridership will | conducive to rail. | network and any measures | largest land owner on the site has | |
| | | | be limited. It would make | The Wake County Transit Plan is | recommended to mitigate such | expressed support for the | |
| | | | sense to stop the project | currently evaluating future potential | impacts. Technical reports that | Farrington Road ROMF | |
| | | | now, and consider other | transit corridors, which could be | report the results of traffic | Alternative. The site would have | |
| | | | options (improved bus | studied if a funding source is | simulations are included as | no effects to historic resources. | |
| | | | routes, eco friendly buses, | secured for transit in Wake County. | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | The Farrington Road ROMF | |
| Mr | Eugene | Eschmann | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|--------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Mrc | Bren | Eskridge | How can light rail be | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | | | |
| IVII 5 | ыеп | LSKITUGE | = | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | | | |
| | | | | the year 2035. For more | | | |
| | | | not even using the buses. | information about ridership please | | | |
| | | | | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | | | |
| | | | | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | | | |
| | | | | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | | | |
| | | | | and Results Report. As noted in the | | | |
| | | | | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | region's existing transit network is | | | |
| | | | | currently operating at close to | | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | | |
| | | | | 1 · · · | | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------|---|--|---|------------|------------|
| N/G | Marsha | Fancher | other transit alternatives can be identified that are far less costly. The estimated number of riders is in excess of the standard percentages of ridership across the country (Source:: Quarterly and Annual Totals by Mode - collected by American Public Transportation Association) | Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | 2040 using the Triangle Regional Model (TRM), Version 5 based on the operating plans included in appendix K.1, consistent with appendix K.2. The TRM was developed by the Triangle Regional Model Service Bureau (TRMSB), in cooperation with regional stakeholders Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO), Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (TRMSB) is housed at the North Carolina State University Institute for Transportation Research and Education (ITRE). The model is designed to forecast travel throughout the Triangle region's transit and roadway system. As such, it contains a network of existing and planned future | | |
| Mrs | Rebekah | Farris | N/G | | transit services consistent with | | |
| Mr. | Charlie | Farris | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Lida | fay | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | margaret | fetters | N/G | | | | |
| | paul | fitts | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Marilyn | Flanary | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Gita | Fleischman | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|---|------------|------------|------------|
| D | lawa wa | Farra | M/a wa ayyaat tha wail | Continue C. 2 of the DEIC process to the | | | |
| Dr. | Jeremy | Force | We request the rail | Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the | | | |
| | | | system not be built near | evaluation of ROMF alternatives and | | | |
| | | | or on Farrington Road. | explains why the NEPA Preferred | | | |
| | | | | Alternative was selected and why | | | |
| | | | | the other alternatives were | | | |
| | | | | eliminated from consideration. The | | | |
| | | | | Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is | | | |
| | | | | included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | In summary, the Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | operations standpoint. It is a 25- | | | |
| | | | | acre site, the largest site of the | | | |
| | | | | alternatives considered. The | | | |
| | | | | Farrington Road ROMF site is | | | |
| | | | | located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross- | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | overs for access to the yard. The site | | | |
| | | | | is reasonably flat, making | | | |
| | | | | preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | screening buffers can be provided | | | |
| | | | | around the site. The largest land | | | |
| | | | | owner on the site has expressed | | | |
| | | | | support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | have no effects to historic | | | |
| | | | | resources. The Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative also has the | | | |
| | | | | lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Jenny | Force | As a local Farrington | Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the | | | |
| , - | , | 1 27 22 | | evaluation of ROMF alternatives and | | | |
| | | | | explains why the NEPA Preferred | | | |
| | | | maintenance facility on | Alternative was selected and why | | | |
| | | | Farrington Rd. | the other alternatives were | | | |
| | | | | eliminated from consideration. The | | | |
| | | | | Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is | | | |
| | | | | included in the NEPA Preferred | | | |
| | | | | Alternative. | | | |
| | | | | In summary, the Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative site is the most | | | |
| | | | | desirable from a construction and | | | |
| | | | | operations standpoint. It is a 25- | | | |
| | | | | acre site, the largest site of the | | | |
| | | | | alternatives considered. The | | | |
| | | | | Farrington Road ROMF site is | | | |
| | | | | located on a long straight section of | | | |
| | | | | track which accommodates cross- | | | |
| | | | | overs for access to the yard. The site | | | |
| | | | | is reasonably flat, making | | | |
| | | | | preparation of the site for | | | |
| | | | | construction easier. Effective | | | |
| | | | | screening buffers can be provided | | | |
| | | | | around the site. The largest land | | | |
| | | | | owner on the site has expressed | | | |
| | | | | support for the Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative. The site would | | | |
| | | | | have no effects to historic | | | |
| | | | | resources. The Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative also has the | | | |
| | | | | lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|---|------------|--|------------|
| Mr | Dick | Ford | be held accountable for | The D-O Corridor was identified as a high priority transit corridor as early as the 1990s due to the rapid growth in the corridor. The D-O Corridor includes the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), Duke University, downtown Durham, and North Carolina Central University (ES-2). | - | The design of the alignment with regards to at-grade crossings, grade-separated crossings, or closures/elimination of crossings is primarily based on an assessment of the topography to be traversed by the alignment as well as the projected traffic on the roadway that is crossed. To maintain the cost effectiveness of the LRT project in order to qualify for federal funding, the alignment will be at-grade unless either of these two criteria requires grade-separation. The topography and traffic at Barbee Chapel Road do not warrant a grade separated crossing. In addition, an elevated LRT alignment crossing over Barbee Chapel Road would conflict with an alternative interchange plan proposed by the NCDOT to elevate Barbee Chapel Road over NC 54. The grade separation planned for Manning Drive is due to the steep topography in this area east of the proposed Mason Farm Road | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------------|---------------------|--|---|---|------------|------------|
| N/G | Rosemary | Ford | disheartening to see the process by which the light rail plan has been maderife with favoritism toward the wealthy city of Chapel Hill and disregard for the interests of East Durham (as well as my own neighborhood of Downing Creek.) | the revenue from the half-cent sales tax in Durham County for public transportation is not being used | The D-O Corridor was identified as a high priority transit corridor as early as the 1990s due to the rapid growth in the corridor. The D-O Corridor includes the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), Duke University, downtown Durham, and North Carolina Central University (ES-2). | | |
| | Cheryl | Fox | N/G | | | | |
| | Mike | Fox | N/G | | | | |
| | Morgan | Fox | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | | Frackoviak | N/G | | | | |
| | Frances | Freedman | N/G N/G | | | | |
| | Joel Susan N | Freelander Friel | I oppose the development and construction of the Durham - Orange county Light Rail Train System. | Comment Noted | | | |
| Ms | Donna | Fudale | N/G | | | | |

| | Fulghieri | low-efficiency light rail project, because | DEIS section 4.8. DEIS section | In addition to minimizing forest fragmentation by following along | Enhancements to bus service are | Land use broadly refers to the |
|----------------|-----------|---|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Fulghieri | I oppose this high-cost, low-efficiency light rail project, because | DEIS section 4.8. DEIS section | · · | | Land use broadly refers to the |
| N/G Deborah Fu | Ü | low-efficiency light rail project, because | DEIS section 4.8. DEIS section | · · | | I and usa brandly rafare to the |
| | | project, because | | fragmentation by following along | | Land use broadly refers to the |
| | | • | 4.8.3.1 summarizes the potential | , , | | different functions of human use |
| | | -on its western half, it is | | existing roadways, both the Little | • | of land (e.g., residential, |
| | | | • | Creek and New Hope Creek | Investment Plans (BRIPs). Both | commercial, industrial) and is |
| | | to be built on protected | Alternative (which includes the | S . | BRIPs were developed and | influenced by development |
| | | Jordan reservoir lands; | Farrington ROMF). Indirect Effects | sections supported by bridge | approved by county | patterns and activity centers, |
| | | -it is designed to serve | to Water Resources are described in | piers. This will allow for | commissioners before the | population and employment |
| | | primarily tax-exempt | DEIS Section4.17. As stated on page | terrestrial wildlife to pass easily | successful sales tax referenda in | levels, growth potential and |
| | | properties in Orange | 4-292, existing federal and state | underneath, maintaining the | 2011 and 2012, and both have | trends, local and regional land use |
| | | County (Friday Center, | regulations (as described previously) | connectivity of this important | guided the provision of new bus | policies, and other factors that |
| | | Mason Farm Road, UNC | would protect water resources from | wildlife corridor. The opening of | service in the two counties over | affect area growth. |
| | | Hospitals); | future indirect or development | forest habitat will also be | the past few years. For more | |
| | | -it explicitly assumes that | related impacts. These regulations | minimized by only clearing | information about provisions for | DEIS section 4.1 describes land |
| | | the CHC School District | include Section 404, with its | vegetation along the rail corridor | improved bus service under the | use and land use policy in the D-O |
| | | will sell Glenwood | avoidance, minimization, and | to the extent necessary and | BRIPs, please see | Corridor and the potential impacts |
| | | Elementary School to | mitigation hierarchy, FEMA | allowing vegetation to | http://ourtransitfuture.com/durh | of the alternatives under study in |
| | | developers (per the | regulations, Section 401 and the | regenerate as close to the rail | am-county-bus-and-rail- | the DEIS. Population and |
| | | Chapel Hill Transportation | Jordan Lake buffer rules, as well as | lines as is safe and practical. | investment-plan/. | employment data related to land |
| | | Planning Manager to the | state approvals of sediment and | Construction impacts could also | | uses are presented in DEIS section |
| | | Planning Board); | erosion control plans. The selected | be minimized by using | As noted in DEIS Table 5.3-1, the | 4.2. |
| | | -all of Orange County is | alignment alternatives for the | techniques such as "top down" | revenue from the half-cent sales | |
| | | paying into this plan | crossings of Little Creek and New | construction, described in section | tax in Durham County for public | Transit-supportive growth and |
| | | which does not serve the | Hope Creek were chosen in part | 4.16 of the DEIS. | transportation is being used to | development is expected to |
| | | Chapel Hill's 15-501 | because of their limited | | fund project development for the | continue throughout the corridor |
| | | commercial corridor; | fragmentation and wildlife impacts. | | proposed D-O LRT Project and to | due largely to positive market |
| | | -and finally, I hate the | At the crossing of Little Creek, the | | implement improvements to | forces, supportive land use |
| | | Orwellian use of | NEPA Preferred C2A alternative | | DATA bus services. In addition, | policies, and capacity for growth |
| | | "preferred route" by | follows along the existing NC 54 for | | the sales tax will be used to | and supportive public |
| | | GoTriangle to describe | much of its length, minimizing | | support the design and | investments. Market support for |
| | | the route through Jordan | additional habitat fragmentation. | | construction of Neighborhood | this type of development includes |
| | | reservoir lands, when it is | The C2A alignment only turns north | | Transit Centers and make | shifting lifestyle preferences |
| N/G Paul Ga | | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|------------|
| Mrs. | Carol | Garth | This limited ridership is | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | Various transit technologies were | The proposed D-O LRT Project | |
| | | | served well by busses and | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | previously studied and evaluated | would be designed and operated | |
| | | | the proposed location for | Project on the existing roadway | in an extensive public process | in accordance with Triangle | |
| | | | rail and vehicle | network and any measures | called the "Alternatives Analysis" | Transit's current safety and | |
| | | | maintenance facility is | recommended to mitigate such | (AA). Technologies considered | security plans. These plans would | |
| | | | targeted for a zoned | impacts. Technical reports that | during the AA included: | be updated to include specific | |
| | | | residential area. I am | report the results of traffic | conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, | requirements for the NEPA | |
| | | | concerned about increase | simulations are included as | Light Rail Transit (LRT), and | Preferred and Project Element | |
| | | | in crime as people have | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | alternatives, reviewed by FTA, | |
| | | | unrestricted access to a | DEIS. | Through the Alternatives | and submitted through the | |
| | | | residential area with | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | Analysis, light rail was selected as | NCDOT State Safety Oversight | |
| | | | limited access at the | proposed mitigation measures that | the best transit technology | process for approval prior to | |
| | | | present time, the impact | are planned to mitigate for project- | option to best serve the Durham- | revenue service. Triangle Transit | |
| | | | on housing values, and | related roadway effects. These | Orange Corridor and to meet the | uses Crime Prevention Through | |
| | | | impeding traffic flow for | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | Purpose and Need of the | Environmental Design (CPTED) | |
| | | | an already overly | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | proposed transit project. The | concepts to assist in deterring | |
| | | | trafficked road being | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | findings of the Alternatives | criminal activity in the design of | |
| | | | Farrington Rd. the | roadway project planned by the | Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 | its facilities. The basic principle of | |
| | | | planned rail crossings will | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | of the DEIS. The Alternatives | CPTED is to increase natural | |
| | | | only worsen the already | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | Analysis is available on | surveillance by providing good | |
| | | | bad situation especially | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | ourtransitfuture.com. | sight-lines and avoiding | |
| | | | during peak hours. We | continue to coordinate with the | | conditions such as tall | |
| | | | don't need this rail | NCDOT as the designs of these | | landscaping that could potentially | |
| | | | service. It is duplicating | projects advance. | | provide individuals with areas to | |
| | | | bus service already | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | hide or obstruct mechanical | |
| | | | provided and is a waste of | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | methods of surveillance, such as | |
| | | | tax money needed | substantial modifications to the | | closed-circuit television (CCTV) | |
| | | | elsewhere. | roadway are incorporated into the | | cameras. | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|
| N/G | David | Gavin | Without a direct line to | Planning for high-capacity transit in | Various transit technologies were | In general, the project is not | |
| | | | RDU airport from | the Triangle region began more | previously studied and evaluated | expected to have a significant | |
| | | | downtown Chapel Hill | than 20 years ago, and a number of | in an extensive public process | effect on traffic on those | |
| | | | AND from downtown | studies have been conducted to | called the "Alternatives Analysis" | roadways where it is close to D-O | |
| | | | Durham, this project is a | advance major transit investments | (AA). Technologies considered | LRT Project, nor always offer a | |
| | | | complete waste of | in the area, including extensive | during the AA included: | faster travel time. However, the | |
| | | | taxpayer dollars. | coordination with stakeholders and | conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, | D-O LRT Project will provide a | |
| | | | There is no possible way | members of the public to develop, | Light Rail Transit (LRT), and | competitive and reliable travel | |
| | | | non rush-hour traffic (or | evaluate, and refine the range of | Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | alternative to the congestion on | |
| | | | rush-hour traffic for that | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | Through the Alternatives | these roadways, particularly | |
| | | | matter) between Durham | studies, white papers, and reports | Analysis, light rail was selected as | during the peak traffic hours and | |
| | | | and Chapel Hill is creating | that identified the need for high- | the best transit technology | will provide improved travel time | |
| | | | sufficient congestion to | capacity transit in the region and | option to best serve the Durham- | reliability compared to bus transit | |
| | | | warrant such an | defined the D-O Corridor are | Orange Corridor and to meet the | services. | |
| | | | expenditure. In fact, | summarized in Section 2.1. These | Purpose and Need of the | | |
| | | | based upon the design | past studies indicate that the | proposed transit project. The | | |
| | | | layout of the system, | estimated demand for a | findings of the Alternatives | | |
| | | | traffic congestion will only | continuously connected rail line to | Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 | | |
| | | | increase, particularly | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | of the DEIS. The Alternatives | | |
| | | | along the highway 54 | cost effective for the Project. | Analysis is available on | | |
| | | | section of the plan near | RTP has a significant number of | ourtransitfuture.com. | | |
| | | | exit 273 on I-40. And if | jobs, but they are widely distributed | | | |
| | | | the goal of the plan is to | and dispersed compared to Chapel | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | | |
| | | | provide transportation to | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | | |
| | | | those unable to afford an | development pattern is not as | Project on the existing roadway | | |
| | | | car, the existing bus | conducive to rail. | network and any measures | | |
| | | | system is already | The Wake County Transit Plan is | recommended to mitigate such | | |
| | | | providing that service | currently evaluating future potential | impacts. Technical reports that | | |
| | | | more than adequately | transit corridors, which could be | report the results of traffic | | |
| | | | and with less | studied if a funding source is | simulations are included as | | |
| | | | intrusiveness to the | secured for transit in Wake County. | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | | |
| Ms | Julia | Geddings | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Weston | Geddings | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Bernard | Geller | N/G | | | | |
| Dr | Eric | Ghysels | N/G | | | | |
| Dr | James | Gibson | N/G | | | | |
| Mrs. | Karen | Gibson | N/G | | | | |
| Dr | James | Gibson | No to light rail | Comment Noted | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Mrs | Charlotte | gilbert | terrible idea!! South Point or 15/501 would be a better use of land - | Hundreds of commuters to UNC from RTP, Morrisville, Cary, and Raleigh already park and ride today at parking lots at Southpoint Mall, Exit 282 off of I-40 at the Regional Transit Center, and at District Drive in Raleigh. They choose to use these bus services even though they are subjected to traffic on NC 54. The light rail, with a major park-and-ride facility at Leigh Village, will offer a higher level of frequency than these routes and will not be subject to traffic congestion in the future when traffic is worse. | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Bill | Gilbert | This is a big waste of tax | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | As described in DEIS section 8.1 | | |
| , | | | _ | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | and further explained in DEIS | | |
| | | | goes nowhere and picks | the year 2035. For more | chapter 1, the investment | | |
| | | | up no one. | information about ridership please | benefits of a project like the D-O | | |
| | | | <u>'</u> | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | LRT include: improved mobility, | | |
| | | | | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | increased connectivity through | | |
| | | | | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | expanded transit options, and | | |
| | | | | and Results Report. As noted in the | support of future development | | |
| | | | | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | |
| | | | | region's existing transit network is | provide a competitive, reliable | | |
| | | | | currently operating at close to | alternative to automobile use | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | that supports compact | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | development. | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | Enhanced mobility will also | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | increase transit operating | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | efficiency: offer a competitive, | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | reliable transportation solution | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | that will reduce travel time. | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | Increased connectivity will | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | expand transit options between | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | Durham and Chapel Hill by | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | enhancing and seamlessly | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | connecting with the existing | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | transit system. | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | In addition, increased | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | connectivity will serve major | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | activity and employment centers | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | between Durham and Chapel Hill: | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | the University of North Carolina | | |
| N/G | Tyler | Glasco | N/G | | | | |
| Mr. | Richard | Glover | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Desiree | Goldman | N/G | | | | |
| ms | shari | Goldstein | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Avery | Goldstein | Do not destroy the most | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | As described in DEIS section 8.1 | | |
| | | | family friendly area in | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | and further explained in DEIS | | |
| | | | Durham! Why would you | the year 2035. For more | chapter 1, the investment | | |
| | | | build a light rail that no | information about ridership please | benefits of a project like the D-O | | |
| | | | one will ride? Please | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | LRT include: improved mobility, | | |
| | | | spend the funds | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | increased connectivity through | | |
| | | | improving our schools | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | expanded transit options, and | | |
| | | | and become a city others | and Results Report. As noted in the | support of future development | | |
| | | | look to as a model instead | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | |
| | | | of a place people make | region's existing transit network is | provide a competitive, reliable | | |
| | | | fun of! | currently operating at close to | alternative to automobile use | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | that supports compact | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | development. | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | Enhanced mobility will also | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | increase transit operating | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | efficiency: offer a competitive, | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | reliable transportation solution | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | that will reduce travel time. | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | Increased connectivity will | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | expand transit options between | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | Durham and Chapel Hill by | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | enhancing and seamlessly | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | connecting with the existing | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | transit system. | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | In addition, increased | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | connectivity will serve major | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | activity and employment centers | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | between Durham and Chapel Hill: | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | the University of North Carolina | | |
| N/G | Susan | Goldstein | Have you seen the back- | Comment Noted | | | |
| | | | up on Farrington Road | | | | |
| | | | during rush hour? There | | | | |
| | | | must be a better place for | | | | |
| | | | this! | | | | |
| | Buddy | Golubiewski | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | kimberly | gooden | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Len | Grande | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Mr | Jim | Green | unsound ridership projections and will not result in any appreciable reduction in automobile congestion in the Chapel Hill-Durham road corridorthe routing of the proposed light rail track is not aligned with the higher density compact neighborhood developments in Orange and Chatham countiesthere is no incentive to take light rail to reduce travel time between Durham and Chapel Hill -Ridership farebox collection only supports a small percentage of the annual operating costsA population density of 30 people per gross acre, or roughly 19,000 people per square mile (ppsm), is necessary in order to | Regional Model Service Bureau (TRMSB), in cooperation with regional stakeholders Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO), Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO), NCDOT, and Triangle Transit. The TRMSB is housed at the North Carolina State University Institute for Transportation Research and Education (ITRE). The model is designed to forecast travel throughout the Triangle region's transit and roadway system. As such, it contains a network of existing and planned future transit services consistent with the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan | different functions of human use of land (e.g., residential, commercial, industrial) and is influenced by development patterns and activity centers, population and employment levels, growth potential and trends, local and regional land use policies, and other factors that affect area growth. DEIS section 4.1 describes land use and land use policy in the D-O Corridor and the potential impacts of the alternatives under study in the DEIS. Population and employment data related to land uses are presented in DEIS section 4.2. Transit-supportive growth and development is expected to continue throughout the corridor due largely to positive market forces, supportive land use policies, and capacity for growth and supportive public investments. Market support for this type of development | for with revenue from fares as well as local tax dollars, including sales tax revenue generated in Durham and Orange counties, funding from North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), and other local fees and taxes. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently under | The Triangle region has experienced extraordinary growth in recent years. Growth forecasts show population in the region increasing by 80 percent between 2010 and 2040, from 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O Corridor, the population is projected to double and the highest expected travel intensity (number of trips per acre) in the Triangle region is predominately located in this corridor. |
| Dr | Sandra | Greene | support light rail transit. N/G | (2040 MTP)." | includes shifting lifestyle | | |
| | Margaret | Gresham | This will ruin my neighborhood. | Comment Noted | | | |
| N/G | Maggie | Griffin | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Shauna | Griffin | N/G | | | | |
| | Erika | Griffin | N/G | | | | |
| Mr. | Albert | Gusman | N/G | - | | | |
| N/G | Stacy | Hagerty | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Dr | Jan | Halle | This light rail is a ruse. | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | The Triangle region has | | |
| | | | - | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | experienced extraordinary | | |
| | | | has been put into | the year 2035. For more | growth in recent years. Growth | | |
| | | | something that must be | information about ridership please | forecasts show population in the | | |
| | | | lining someone's pocket. | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | region increasing by 80 percent | | |
| | | | There is not significant | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | between 2010 and 2040, from | | |
| | | | population density to | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O | | |
| | | | | and Results Report. As noted in the | | | |
| | | | | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | projected to double and the | | |
| | | | don't know but someone. | region's existing transit network is | highest expected travel intensity | | |
| | | | | | , | | |
| | | | | currently operating at close to | (number of trips per acre) in the | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | Triangle region is predominately | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | located in this corridor. | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | | |
| Mr | Steven | Hamelly | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Martha | Hamlett | Needs more study | Comment Noted | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|--------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------------|
| Dr | David | Hardman | The Durham Orange Light | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | Various transit technologies were | As described in DEIS section 8.1 | |
| | Davia | Tidi dilidii | | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | previously studied and evaluated | | |
| | | | | the year 2035. For more | ' | chapter 1, the investment | |
| | | | does it address the | information about ridership please | ' ' | benefits of a project like the D-O | |
| | | | | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | | LRT include: improved mobility, | |
| | | | | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | | increased connectivity through | |
| | | | | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | _ | expanded transit options, and | |
| | | | _ | and Results Report. As noted in the | | support of future development | |
| | | | in the Durham-Orange | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | _ | plans. Enhanced mobility will | |
| | | | corridor will be cheaper, | region's existing transit network is | | provide a competitive, reliable | |
| | | | flexible, sustainable, and | 3 | Analysis, light rail was selected as | | |
| | | | will minimize negative | maximum capacity including 84 | · | that supports compact | |
| | | | environmental impact. I | buses per hour servicing UNC | option to best serve the Durham- | · ' ' | |
| | | | · | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | Orange Corridor and to meet the | development. | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | | Enhanced mobility will also | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | • | increase transit operating | |
| | | | viable plan. | Medical Centers. As further detailed | | efficiency: offer a competitive, | |
| | | | viable piali. | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 | reliable transportation solution | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | • | that will reduce travel time. | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | | Increased connectivity will | |
| | | | | • | | expand transit options between | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | | Durham and Chapel Hill by | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | | enhancing and seamlessly | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | connecting with the existing | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | transit system. | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | transit system. | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | | In addition, increased | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | between Durham and Chapel Hill: | |
| | | | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | the University of North Carolina | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Ms | Cheryl | Hardman | | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | Planning for high-capacity transit | _ | |
| | | | in Orange and Durham | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | | Request to Enter the New Starts | |
| | | | counties. It is a waste of | the year 2035. For more | , , , | Program Project Development | |
| | | | | information about ridership please | | Phase for the proposed Durham- | |
| | | | | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | | Orange Light Rail Transit Project: | |
| | | | RTP. | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | transit investments in the area, | | |
| | | | Low ridership on existing | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | including extensive coordination | "Within the D-O Corridor, transit | |
| | | | buses. | and Results Report. As noted in the | with stakeholders and members | use already rivals larger | |
| | | | | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | of the public to develop, | municipalities. For example, | |
| | | | | region's existing transit network is | evaluate, and refine the range of | when Chapel Hill Transit, Durham | |
| | | | | currently operating at close to | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The | Area Transit Authority, Duke | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | key studies, white papers, and | University Transit, and Triangle | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | reports that identified the need | Transit riders are counted | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | for high-capacity transit in the | together, approximately 70,000 | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | region and defined the D-O | transit trips occur every weekday | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | Corridor are summarized in | within and between Chapel Hill | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | Section 2.1. These past studies | and Durham. This level of | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | indicate that the estimated | ridership is comparable to the | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | demand for a continuously | roughly 73,000 daily transit trips | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | connected rail line to RDU and | taken in Charlotte in 2006, the | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | RTP is not warranted or cost | year before the LYNX Blue Line | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | effective for the Project. | Light Rail Transit Line opened." | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | RTP has a significant number of | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | jobs, but they are widely | Since Charlotte opened the Blue | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | distributed and dispersed | Line in 2007, Charlotte has | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | continued to expand its rail | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | | transit system. In 2015 it opened | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | • | the Gold Line (streetcar) and is | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | currently in the process of | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | constructing Blue Line Extension | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | (LRT). | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| \Ms | Kimberly | Hardman | This electric rail system is | In general, light rail transit is a very | Planning for high-capacity transit | State Funding | Various transit technologies were |
| | | | - | | in the Triangle region began | A provision was added to the | previously studied and evaluated |
| | | | between Durham and | FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics | more than 20 years ago, and a | final version of the state budget | in an extensive public process |
| | | | Chapel Hill | Report available on the site | number of studies have been | that limits the use of state funds | called the "Alternatives Analysis" |
| | | | It is unsafe, based on | referenced above, crash rates for | conducted to advance major | for light rail projects to \$500,000. | (AA). Technologies considered |
| | | | statistics in other cities. | rail transit in the US ranged from | transit investments in the area, | GoTriangle remains confident | during the AA included: |
| | | | It is unfunded by at least | 2.16 accidents per 100 million | including extensive coordination | that the funding cap can be | conventional bus, Bus Rapid |
| | | | 40 percent and could be | Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents | with stakeholders and members | addressed in the future and will | Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail |
| | | | higher with cost over | per 100 million Passenger Miles for | of the public to develop, | continue to seek state funding for | Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail |
| | | | runs. | the six-year study period in that | evaluate, and refine the range of | the D-O LRT project. Potential | Transit (CRT). Through the |
| | | | It is old technology. As a | report. For comparison, statistics on | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The | impacts of the funding cap are | Alternatives Analysis, light rail was |
| | | | millenial, I prefer using | motor vehicle crash rates are | key studies, white papers, and | still being assessed. | selected as the best transit |
| | | | uber or my own car. | available from NCDOT at the | reports that identified the need | CAN ADD THIS | technology option to best serve |
| | | | It is not connecting to | _ | for high-capacity transit in the | However, construction of the D-O | the Durham-Orange Corridor and |
| | | | anything in Wake County, | https://connect.ncdot.gov/resource | region and defined the D-O | LRT Project will be funded | to meet the Purpose and Need of |
| | | | the airport or Southpoint | s/safety/pages/crash-data.aspx. | Corridor are summarized in | through a variety of local, state, | the proposed transit project. The |
| | | | where I may actually use | | Section 2.1. These past studies | and federal sources. The local | findings of the Alternatives |
| | | | it. | | indicate that the estimated | funding will be paid from a | Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 |
| | | | | | demand for a continuously | portion of the half-cent sales tax | of the DEIS. The Alternatives |
| | | | | | connected rail line to RDU and | dedicated for transit in Durham | Analysis is available on |
| | | | | | RTP is not warranted or cost | and Orange counties, \$10 annual | ourtransitfuture.com. |
| | | | | | effective for the Project. | vehicle registration fee dedicated | |
| | | | | | RTP has a significant number of | for transit, and 5% tax surcharge | |
| | | | | | jobs, but they are widely | on car rentals dedicated for | |
| | | | | | distributed and dispersed | transit. Other local funding | |
| | | | | | compared to Chapel Hill and | sources such as value capture | |
| | | | | | Durham. This dispersed | strategies may also be pursued. | |
| | | | | | development pattern is not as | State funding is allocated to the | |
| | | | | | conducive to rail. | project through the State | |
| | | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | Transportation Improvement | |
| | | | | | currently evaluating future | Program. Federal funding is | |
| N/G | Jack | Harless | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|---|---|------------|
| | Toby | Harrell | Review this D-O rail routing. As it stands, it is significantly hazardous and a major | In general, light rail transit is a very safe mode of transportation. Per FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics Report available on the site referenced above, crash rates for rail transit in the US ranged from 2.16 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles for the six-year study period in that report. For comparison, statistics on motor vehicle crash rates are available from NCDOT at the following link: | There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During non-peak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times. | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will | Response 4 |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------|---|--|--|--|------------|
| N/G | Cheryl | Harrell | It is disruptive to neighborhoods and is not cost effective. Instead increase bus frequency | Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. On- time performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse than the overall Triangle Transit system average (Table 1.3- 1 and Figure 1.3-3). As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of | benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating | |
| Ms | Bette | Harrington | N/G | | | | |
| | Diane | Hartley | I share a desire to solve congestion and traffic issues. This light rail, as currently planned, does neither. | In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours. | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|---|------------|------------|
| N/G | Barbara | Harwell | I own property on the corner of Barbee Chapel & Pearl Lane & am very concerned about the number and frequency of highway crossings and safety issues. | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines. | In general, light rail transit is a very safe mode of transportation. Per FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics Report available on the site referenced above, crash rates for rail transit in the US ranged from 2.16 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles for the six-year study period in that report. For comparison, statistics on motor vehicle crash rates are available from NCDOT at the following link: https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/safety/pages/crashdata.aspx. | | |
| Mr. | Thomas | Hauck | N/G | | | | |
| | Bonnie | Hauser | | | | | |
| N/G | Kathleen | Havlin | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Erika | Hawkins | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Michelle | Hayward | N/G | | | | |

| Titl | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|------|-----------|-----------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Dr. | Robert | Healy | Chapel will do almost nothing to relieve congestion on 15-501, has an astronomical cost per rider, will have impacts on neighborhoods and on wetlands, and will drain | expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours. | and 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at the Farrington Road site will require land use entitlements including a comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning. It is expected that the City and/or County of Durham will place conditions on the approvals that appropriate mitigation measures are included in the design, including strategies to complement the surrounding context such as use of architectural styles and/or landscape design. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with property owners and residents near the site to develop and refine these strategies. The public will also have the opportunity to comment on the design through a public hearing as part of the | increased mobility and improved access and connectivity. The Light Rail Alternative would serve as a spine to link the residential growth with new employment opportunities in the D-O Corridor. A discussion of potential impacts to minority and low-income populations is provided in detail in DEIS chapter 5. As listed in Table 4.2-4, the proposed station areas of the NEPA Preferred Alternative would serve approximately | The selected alignment alternatives for the crossings of Little Creek and New Hope Creek were chosen in part because of their limited fragmentation and wildlife impacts. At the crossing of Little Creek, the NEPA Preferred C2A alternative follows along the existing NC 54 for much of its length, minimizing additional habitat fragmentation. The C2A alignment only turns north along George King Road, away from NC 54, in an area of upland forest, and avoids the highest quality bottomland forest habitat of the Little Creek corridor. Similarly, the NEPA Preferred NHC 2 alternative avoids cutting through the intact inner portions of the New Hope Creek bottomland forest by following along the existing US 15- 501 through the most sensitive portions of the New Hope Creek bottomlands. In addition to minimizing forest fragmentation by following along existing roadways, both the Little Creek and New Hope Creek crossings will feature raised rail sections supported by bridge |
| Mrs | Denise | Heil | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|---|------------|
| N/G | James | Heil | system are an ineffective way to use taxpayer money. The GoTriangle buses already cover this route. If demand increases, just add more buses! The cost is minimal compared to a train. I've heard bus and train funding are considered separately. This needs to be combined to ensure fiscal responsibility. If a train is inevitable, it needs to run to the RTP and | Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is | and the continuation of automobile-oriented development patterns. The region's explosive growth is also outpacing the ability to repair, replace and expand the existing roadway network. Considering financial and environmental issues, simply increasing highway capacity to meet these demands is no longer a viable option (ES-5). As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence | and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between | |
| Mr. | D. Bruce | Henschel | N/G | secured for transit in Wake County. | for bus routes in the corridor. On- | the University of North Carolina | |
| | Rosemary | Herbst | Totally against Light Rail. | Comment Noted | | | |
| Mrs | Belinda | Hereghty | N/G | | | | |
| Mrs | Anne | Heymann | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Wesley | Heymann | so not a fan. | Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. | | | |
| N/G | N | Hibbard | I don't think it is "enough" and the "shed" is a major issue in terms of appearance/traffic, etc. | Comment Noted | | | |
| Dr | Anthony | Hickey | N/G | | | | |
| | Steve | Hicks | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Lydia | Hill | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|---|---|------------|------------|------------|
| Mr | Peter | Hinkle | | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West Campus, Duke and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical | | | |
| Mr | Peter | Hinkle | Bs3z | | | | |
| N/G | Mike and Denise | Hoffman | N/G | | | | |
| | Michael | Hoglund | I support the petition to reject the proposed Durham-Orange Light rail project. | Comment Noted | | | |
| | Lucinda | Hohn | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Thomas | Hohn | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Donald | Holloway | We do not need it, it is | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and | In order to construct, operate, | | |
| , | | , | too extremely expensive, | further explained in DEIS chapter 1, | and maintain the proposed D-O | | |
| | | | | the investment benefits of a project | LRT Project, it will be necessary | | |
| | | | of others. | like the D-O LRT include: improved | for Triangle Transit to acquire | | |
| | | | | mobility, increased connectivity | private property. When property | | |
| | | | | through expanded transit options, | is selected to be acquired, all | | |
| | | | | and support of future development | | | |
| | | | | plans. Enhanced mobility will | considered. That property will | | |
| | | | | provide a competitive, reliable | have been determined to be the | | |
| | | | | alternative to automobile use that | best location for the D-O LRT | | |
| | | | | supports compact development. | Project to serve the public. As a | | |
| | | | | | result, some citizens may be | | |
| | | | | Enhanced mobility will also increase | displaced from their homes or | | |
| | | | | transit operating efficiency: offer a | businesses. | | |
| | | | | competitive, reliable transportation | | | |
| | | | | solution that will reduce travel time. | Local, state, and federal | | |
| | | | | Increased connectivity will expand | regulations and laws govern the | | |
| | | | | transit options between Durham | acquisition of private property | | |
| | | | | and Chapel Hill by enhancing and | for public use. These laws ensure | | |
| | | | | seamlessly connecting with the | that owners of property acquired | | |
| | | | | existing transit system. | for public projects are treated | | |
| | | | | | fairly and consistently. They are | | |
| | | | | In addition, increased connectivity | designed to encourage and | | |
| | | | | will serve major activity and | expedite acquisition by | | |
| | | | | employment centers between | agreements with property | | |
| | | | | Durham and Chapel Hill: the | owners, to minimize litigation | | |
| | | | | University of North Carolina at | and relieve congestion in the | | |
| | | | | Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, | courts, and to promote public | | |
| | | | | US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West | confidence in land acquisition | | |
| | | | | Campus, Duke and Durham | programs designed to benefit the | | |
| | | | | Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical | public as a whole. | | |
| Ms. | Elaine | Holmes | N/G | | | | |
| Mr. | Dennis | House | N/G | | | | |
| Mrs. | Elizabeth | House | N/G | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-------------|-----------|--|---|---|---|------------|
| Ms | Grace Meyer | Howell | | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate | There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During non-peak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times. | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina | |
| Dr. | Ping-Chuan | Hu | It is none sense to put a railroad in front of a well-established niborhood. While the other side of the highway was empty. Don't do it. | The location of the proposed Woodmont Station is located on the south side of NC 54 to support a significant portion of the Town of Chapel Hill's Future Focus area for growth along NC 54. Running the alignment along the north side of NC 54 and subsequently the placement of the Woodmont Station would not be supportive of the Town of Chapel Hill's growth policies. | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| N/G | Burk and | Huey | N/G | | | | |
| 14/0 | Mary | liuey | IV/ G | | | | |
| N/G | Dale | Huff | We do not support the | DEIS section 4.10.4 and table 4.10-6 | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | URS/AECOM, a company | |
| , - | | | proposed Light Rail plan. | provides a summary of the noise | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | consulting with Triangle Transit, | |
| | | | It needs an independent | and vibration impacts for the | Project on the existing roadway | prepared the technical | |
| | | | review by qualified | alternatives. For the proposed D-O | network and any measures | information and environmental | |
| | | | experts to assure better | LRT Project, it is anticipated that | recommended to mitigate such | impact analysis for the Project on | |
| | | | options are found. Both | severe noise impacts would occur at | impacts. Technical reports that | behalf of the Federal Transit | |
| | | | traffic and noise issues | one location and moderate noise | report the results of traffic | Administration as well as | |
| | | | created by the plan are | impacts would occur at four | simulations are included as | GoTriangle. The DEIS was | |
| | | | unacceptable. | locations with the NEPA Preferred | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | prepared in accordance with the | |
| | | | | Alternative. Vibration impacts | DEIS. | National Environmental Policy Act | |
| | | | | would occur at 8 receptors and | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | (NEPA), as well as Moving Ahead | |
| | | | | ground-borne noise impacts would | proposed mitigation measures | for Progress in the 21st Century | |
| | | | | occur at 13 receptors with the NEPA | that are planned to mitigate for | Act (MAP-21); Environmental | |
| | | | | Preferred Alternative. Other | project-related roadway effects. | Impact and Related Procedures of | |
| | | | | alternative alignments would result | These effects are summarized in | 1987 [23 Code of Federal | |
| | | | | in some additional impacts at | Table 3.2-3. In addition, as | Regulations (CFR) § 771]; Section | |
| | | | | receptors, but the number of | described in DEIS section 3.2.2, | 4(f) of the US Department of | |
| | | | | additional impact locations is not | there are numerous roadway | Transportation (USDOT) Act of | |
| | | | | substantial. None of the ROMF sites | project planned by the NCDOT in | 1966 [49 U.S.C. § 303] and [23 | |
| | | | | would result in noise or vibration | the vicinity of the proposed D-O | CFR § 774]; and Section 404 of | |
| | | | | impacts. | LRT Project. During Engineering, | the Clean Water Act of 1977 [33 | |
| | | | | | Triangle Transit will continue to | U.S.C. § 1251], among others. A | |
| | | | | Figures 4.10-6 through 4.10-9 | coordinate with the NCDOT as | legal sufficiency review of the | |
| | | | | illustrate the locations of receptors | the designs of these projects | DEIS was also conducted by the | |
| | | | | that would be impacted by the | advance. | FTA and Triangle Transit. | |
| | | | | NEPA Preferred and Project Element | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | |
| | | | | Alternatives. Additional detail on | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | |
| | | | | the impacted receptors is provided | substantial modifications to the | | |
| | | | | in appendix K.24. | roadway are incorporated into | | |
| | | | | | the design including additional | | |
| | | | | As described in 4.10, noise and | turn bays and restriping of | | |
| N/G | Andrea | Huffman | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Laura | Hulett | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|---|---|------------|------------|
| Dr | Charles | Humble | my initial position was in favor of Light Rail. However, we are not Boston and our many communities in the | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis | GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in | | |
| N/G | Robert | Humphreys | Many of the assumptions and justifications for use of the Durham-orange Light Rail seem erroneous and not realistic. | Comment Noted | DEIS section 3.2. | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|---------------|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Stephanie | Humphreys | Many of the assumptions and justifications for use of the Durham-orange Light Rail seem erroneous and unrealistic. | | | | |
| N/G | Makiko | Humphreys | Many of the assumptions and justifications for use of the Durham-orange Light Rail seem erroneous and unrealistic. | Comment Noted | | | |
| Mr | Craig | Hyatt | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Marija | Ivanovic | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Susan | Jackson | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Matthew | Jackson | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Paul | Jackson | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Reitha | Jackson | Unbelievable that you would even consider doing this project. Traffic, parking and a station that doesn't even serve our community. Please stop this project now! | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Mr. | Sonny | Jackson | | | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | There will be 12 trains per hour | |
| | | | | previously studied and evaluated in | · | during peak service (six per | |
| | | | , | · | Project on the existing roadway | direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and | |
| | | | NOT need the entrance to | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | network and any measures | 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is | |
| | | | our development messed | Technologies considered during the | recommended to mitigate such | anticipated to be | |
| | | | up or blocked in anyway | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, | impacts. Technical reports that | disrupted/blocked due to gate | |
| | | | and do not need added | Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), | report the results of traffic | activation for approximately 30 | |
| | | | traffic problems. There | and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | simulations are included as | seconds per crossing. This | |
| | | | are enough traffic issues | Through the Alternatives Analysis, | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | includes the time for the | |
| | | | already. | light rail was selected as the best | DEIS. | following stages of the gate | |
| | | | | transit technology option to best | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | activation: gates descending, | |
| | | | | serve the Durham-Orange Corridor | proposed mitigation measures | gates fully down ahead of the | |
| | | | | and to meet the Purpose and Need | that are planned to mitigate for | arrival of the train, gates fully | |
| | | | | of the proposed transit project. The | project-related roadway effects. | down during passage of the train, | |
| | | | | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | These effects are summarized in | gates ascending. | |
| | | | | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | Table 3.2-3. In addition, as | Traffic would be unobstructed | |
| | | | | The Alternatives Analysis is available | described in DEIS section 3.2.2, | during approximately 90% of an | |
| | | | | on ourtransitfuture.com. | there are numerous roadway | hour during peak hours. During | |
| | | | | | project planned by the NCDOT in | non-peak times (9:00am to | |
| | | | | | the vicinity of the proposed D-O | 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), | |
| | | | | | LRT Project. During Engineering, | there will be six trains per hour | |
| | | | | | Triangle Transit will continue to | (three per direction). Accordingly, | |
| | | | | | coordinate with the NCDOT as | traffic would be unobstructed | |
| | | | | | the designs of these projects | during approximately 95% of an | |
| | | | | | advance. | hour during non-peak times. | |
| | | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | |
| | | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | |
| | | | | | substantial modifications to the | | |
| | | | | | roadway are incorporated into | | |
| | | | | | the design including additional | | |
| | | | | | turn bays and restriping of | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| Dr. | Rachida | Jackson | This project is very | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | Various transit technologies were | As described in DEIS section 8.1 | |
| J | racinaa | Jackson | expensive, and it is not | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | previously studied and evaluated | | |
| | | | going to help us. It is | Project on the existing roadway | in an extensive public process | chapter 1, the investment | |
| | | | going to make our life | network and any measures | called the "Alternatives Analysis" | benefits of a project like the D-O | |
| | | | miserable and create | recommended to mitigate such | (AA). Technologies considered | LRT include: improved mobility, | |
| | | | more traffic and stress. | impacts. Technical reports that | during the AA included: | increased connectivity through | |
| | | | If many people are | report the results of traffic | conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, | expanded transit options, and | |
| | | | against it, then you need | simulations are included as | Light Rail Transit (LRT), and | support of future development | |
| | | | to find a solution to this | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | plans. Enhanced mobility will | |
| | | | huge problem! | DEIS. | Through the Alternatives | provide a competitive, reliable | |
| | | | | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | Analysis, light rail was selected as | alternative to automobile use | |
| | | | | proposed mitigation measures that | the best transit technology | that supports compact | |
| | | | | are planned to mitigate for project- | option to best serve the Durham- | development. | |
| | | | | related roadway effects. These | Orange Corridor and to meet the | | |
| | | | | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | Purpose and Need of the | Enhanced mobility will also | |
| | | | | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | proposed transit project. The | increase transit operating | |
| | | | | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | findings of the Alternatives | efficiency: offer a competitive, | |
| | | | | roadway project planned by the | Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 | reliable transportation solution | |
| | | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | of the DEIS. The Alternatives | that will reduce travel time. | |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | Analysis is available on | Increased connectivity will | |
| | | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | ourtransitfuture.com. | expand transit options between | |
| | | | | continue to coordinate with the | | Durham and Chapel Hill by | |
| | | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | | enhancing and seamlessly | |
| | | | | projects advance. | | connecting with the existing | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | transit system. | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | | In addition, increased | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | | connectivity will serve major | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | | activity and employment centers | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | | between Durham and Chapel Hill: | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | | the University of North Carolina | |
| N/G | Jane | Jannelli | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Valarie | jarvls | N/G | | | | |
| Mr. | Immanuel | Jarvis | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Larry | Jenkins | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Dr. | Pamela | Jenkins | The proposed route of | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | URS/AECOM, a company | | |
| | | | the light rail makes no | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | consulting with Triangle Transit, | | |
| | | | - | the year 2035. For more | prepared the technical | | |
| | | | the intention of the rail. | information about ridership please | information and environmental | | |
| | | | An independent auditor | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | impact analysis for the Project on | | |
| | | | needs to review the plan | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | behalf of the Federal Transit | | |
| | | | to make | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | Administration as well as | | |
| | | | recommendations on how | and Results Report. As noted in the | GoTriangle. The DEIS was | | |
| | | | to get this plan back on | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | prepared in accordance with the | | |
| | | | the correct path. | region's existing transit network is | National Environmental Policy | | |
| | | | | currently operating at close to | Act (NEPA), as well as Moving | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | Ahead for Progress in the 21st | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | Century Act (MAP-21); | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | Environmental Impact and | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | Related Procedures of 1987 [23 | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | Code of Federal Regulations | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | (CFR) § 771]; Section 4(f) of the | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | US Department of Transportation | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | (USDOT) Act of 1966 [49 U.S.C. § | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | 303] and [23 CFR § 774]; and | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | Section 404 of the Clean Water | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | Act of 1977 [33 U.S.C. § 1251], | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | among others. A legal sufficiency | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | review of the DEIS was also | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | conducted by the FTA and | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | Triangle Transit. | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Mrs | Julie | Johnson | Please do not allow the | The Town of Chapel Hill requested | The C1A Alternative has the | | |
| | | | light rail project to go | that alternatives to the C1 | longest length of the Little Creek | | |
| | | | through. The | alignments be studied as part of the | | | |
| | | | communities it will impact | Alternatives Analysis for the Project. | the longest travel times and least | | |
| | | | · · | As a result, the Project team | ridership of the Little Creek | | |
| | | | families in an area that | developed the C2 alignments as part | Alternatives. In terms of impacts | | |
| | | | was never designed to | of the Alternatives Analysis. In | to the natural environment, the | | |
| | | | support such a project. | February 2012, the Durham-Chapel | C1A Alternative would impact | | |
| | | | While meadowmont was | Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning | undisturbed forested areas and | | |
| | | | the obvious choice (and | Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted | wetlands associated with Little | | |
| | | | was created to be such a | the proposed D-O LRT Project, | Creek, in particular, the Little | | |
| | | | center) now that it is off | including both the C1 and C2 | Creek Bottomlands and Slopes | | |
| | | | the table please do not go | alignment corridors. | Significant Natural Heritage Area | | |
| | | | ahead with plan B. Please | | on the periphery of the USACE- | | |
| | | | stand up for those who | The Town of Chapel Hill expressed | owned property. | | |
| | | | do not have the bullying | its preference for an alignment | | | |
| | | | power that meadowmont | running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A | Therefore, as compared to the | | |
| | | | has used. Please do not | Alternatives) that would be more | NEPA Preferred Alternative (C2A) | | |
| | | | allow this! | supportive of planned future | and the other alternatives, the | | |
| | | | | growth than C1 and C1A | C1A Alternative would not | | |
| | | | | Alternatives. These alternatives | minimize adverse impacts to the | | |
| | | | | would result in a conversion of less | natural environment or use and | | |
| | | | | dense land uses into higher density | enhance existing and | | |
| | | | | uses near stations. These impacts | underutilized transportation | | |
| | | | | are considered beneficial and | rights-of-way. | | |
| | | | | consistent with local planning. | | | |
| | | | | | The evaluation of the NEPA | | |
| | | | | The C1 Alternative would impact | Preferred Alternative and all | | |
| | | | | undisturbed natural areas including | Project Element Alternatives are | | |
| | | | | the Little Creek Bottomlands and | included in the DEIS and are | | |
| | | | | Slopes Significant Natural Heritage | summarized in DEIS chapter 8, | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Mr | Timothy | Johnson | There are significant | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or | | | |
| | | | safety concerns with the | eliminate pedestrian and motorist | | | |
| | | | Downing Creek and Little | conflicts with transit vehicles. | | | |
| | | | John crossings and nearby | Detailed information regarding the | | | |
| | | | station in the proposed | roadways, sidewalks, and trails | | | |
| | | | plan. Not to mention the | expected to be affected by the | | | |
| | | | questionable rationale | proposed D-O LRT Project is | | | |
| | | | given a station within | provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS | | | |
| | | | walking distance at the | section 3.6, and the Basis for | | | |
| | | | Friday Center (with | Engineering Design (appendix L). | | | |
| | | | significantly more parking | To avoid the potential for incidents | | | |
| | | | area too) and that | at -grade intersections, crossings | | | |
| | | | Meadowmont was | would be signalized or equipped | | | |
| | | | designed to have light rail | with gates with bells to warn of | | | |
| | | | run through it. | oncoming trains. The trains will also | | | |
| | | | | have bells and horns. Bells, gates, | | | |
| | | | | and horns would be activated | | | |
| | | | | according to Triangle Transit | | | |
| | | | | operating procedures and safety | | | |
| | | | | guidelines. | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|---|------------|------------|------------|
| N/C | Nancy | Johnson | If this project included the | Planning for high-capacity transit in | | | |
| IN/G | ivalicy | JOHNSON | | the Triangle region began more | | | |
| | | | | 1 | | | |
| | | | | than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | does not, it does not. | advance major transit investments | | | |
| | | | | in the area, including extensive | | | |
| | | | | coordination with stakeholders and | | | |
| | | | | members of the public to develop, | | | |
| | | | | evaluate, and refine the range of | | | |
| | | | | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | | | |
| | | | | studies, white papers, and reports | | | |
| | | | | that identified the need for high- | | | |
| | | | | capacity transit in the region and | | | |
| | | | | defined the D-O Corridor are | | | |
| | | | | summarized in Section 2.1. These | | | |
| | | | | past studies indicate that the | | | |
| | | | | estimated demand for a | | | |
| | | | | continuously connected rail line to | | | |
| | | | | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | | | |
| | | | | cost effective for the Project. | | | |
| | | | | RTP has a significant number of | | | |
| | | | | jobs, but they are widely distributed | | | |
| | | | | and dispersed compared to Chapel | | | |
| | | | | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | | | |
| | | | | development pattern is not as | | | |
| | | | | conducive to rail. | | | |
| | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | | | |
| | | | | currently evaluating future potential | | | |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be | | | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is | | | |
| | | | | secured for transit in Wake County. | | | |
| N/G | James | Johnson | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Leslie | Johnson | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Mark | Johnson | The economic "case" for | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and | | | |
| | | | this project proposal is | further explained in DEIS chapter 1, | | | |
| | | | less than weak, but the | the investment benefits of a project | | | |
| | | | cost is enormous. This is | like the D-O LRT include: improved | | | |
| | | | at best a complete | mobility, increased connectivity | | | |
| | | | boondoggle. | through expanded transit options, | | | |
| | | | | and support of future development | | | |
| | | | | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | | |
| | | | | provide a competitive, reliable | | | |
| | | | | alternative to automobile use that | | | |
| | | | | supports compact development. | | | |
| | | | | Enhanced mobility will also increase | | | |
| | | | | transit operating efficiency: offer a | | | |
| | | | | competitive, reliable transportation | | | |
| | | | | solution that will reduce travel time. | | | |
| | | | | Increased connectivity will expand | | | |
| | | | | transit options between Durham | | | |
| | | | | and Chapel Hill by enhancing and | | | |
| | | | | seamlessly connecting with the | | | |
| | | | | existing transit system. | | | |
| | | | | In addition, increased connectivity | | | |
| | | | | will serve major activity and | | | |
| | | | | employment centers between | | | |
| | | | | Durham and Chapel Hill: the | | | |
| | | | | University of North Carolina at | | | |
| | | | | Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, | | | |
| | | | | US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West | | | |
| | | | | Campus, Duke and Durham | | | |
| | | | | Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical | | | |
| | amy | jones | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Bishop | Jordan | It is a waste of money | Comment Noted | | | |
| | | | that is not supported by | | | | |
| | | | the facts. | | | | |
| | Spencia | Joyner | N/G | | | | |
| | Joseph | Kalo | N/G | | | | |
| esso r | | | | | | | |
| Dr. | David | Kao | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Mr | Laurence | Katz | The current transit | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | As stated in Triangle Transit's | | |
| | | | system is underutilized | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | Request to Enter the New Starts | | |
| | | | and there is no reliable | the year 2035. For more | Program Project Development | | |
| | | | evidence that the light rail | information about ridership please | Phase for the proposed Durham- | | |
| | | | will be better utilized. | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | Orange Light Rail Transit Project: | | |
| | | | There is evidence that the | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | | | |
| | | | light rail will be an | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | "Within the D-O Corridor, transit | | |
| | | | environmental and | and Results Report. As noted in the | use already rivals larger | | |
| | | | economic disaster and | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | municipalities. For example, | | |
| | | | needs to be stopped. The | region's existing transit network is | when Chapel Hill Transit, Durham | | |
| | | | federal government | currently operating at close to | Area Transit Authority, Duke | | |
| | | | should not waste money | maximum capacity including 84 | University Transit, and Triangle | | |
| | | | on this project. | buses per hour servicing UNC | Transit riders are counted | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | together, approximately 70,000 | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | transit trips occur every weekday | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | within and between Chapel Hill | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | and Durham. This level of | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | ridership is comparable to the | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | roughly 73,000 daily transit trips | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | taken in Charlotte in 2006, the | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | year before the LYNX Blue Line | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | Light Rail Transit Line opened." | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | Since Charlotte opened the Blue | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | Line in 2007, Charlotte has | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | continued to expand its rail | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | transit system. In 2015 it opened | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | the Gold Line (streetcar) and is | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | currently in the process of | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | constructing Blue Line Extension | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | (LRT). | | |

| | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|--|---|---|------------|
| N/G L | | Kelly | Agree that the Farrington corridor is not the appropriate location for a train track much less a train maintenance depot. Regardless of the historic home sites, which would be a shame to lose, the area just is not large enough to accommodate such an undertaking. Using 15-501 makes much more sense, and trains could run right down the | Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates crossovers for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. The Farrington Road | Section 4.4.3.1 states that for visual impacts Triangle Transit will use interdisciplinary design teams to create aesthetics guidelines and stands in the design of project elements and provide landscaping and aesthetic treatments within close proximity to residences. | Various alternative alignments were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Alternatives considered during the AA included routes along US 15-501. | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Everett | Kemp | This project wastes hard earned resources of residents to build an unusable system destroying natural areas and creating problems for residents. The only benefit of the project is to allow some uninformed government officials the opportunity to grandstand about their accomplishment. | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| N/G | james | kernodle | You can count the train | | As described in DEIS section 8.1 | | |
| | | | passengers nowon one | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | and further explained in DEIS | | |
| | | | hand. Not enuff people | the year 2035. For more | chapter 1, the investment | | |
| | | | ride nowits a waste of | information about ridership please | benefits of a project like the D-O | | |
| | | | our money.STOP THE | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | LRT include: improved mobility, | | |
| | | | | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | increased connectivity through | | |
| | | | money! | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | expanded transit options, and | | |
| | | | | and Results Report. As noted in the | | | |
| | | | | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | |
| | | | | region's existing transit network is | provide a competitive, reliable | | |
| | | | | currently operating at close to | alternative to automobile use | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | that supports compact | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | development. | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | Enhanced mobility will also | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | increase transit operating | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | efficiency: offer a competitive, | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | reliable transportation solution | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | that will reduce travel time. | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | Increased connectivity will | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | expand transit options between | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | Durham and Chapel Hill by | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | enhancing and seamlessly | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | connecting with the existing | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | transit system. | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | , | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | In addition, increased | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | connectivity will serve major | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | activity and employment centers | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | • | | |
| | | | | or me and attract new residents and | the onlycisity of North Carolina | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|---------------------|-----------|--|------------|---|------------|------------|
| | Graham and Susan | King | issue. A real estate friend has told us our property | , | Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail. | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N.4 m | EDWARD | KINNAIRD | I do not support the light | Various transit tachnologies were | As stated in DEIS section 7.1, | | |
| Mr | EDWARD | KINNAIKD | | 1 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| | | | rail proposal (DOLRT). | previously studied and evaluated in | | | |
| | | | ' ' | | Project is fully advanced through | | |
| | | | | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | the New Starts process, it is | | |
| | | | | Technologies considered during the | • | | |
| | | | project. While | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, | | | |
| | | | transportation is an | | approximately 50 percent of the | | |
| | | | important issue for our | | D-O LRT Project's capital cost. | | |
| | | | area, I believe this | Through the Alternatives Analysis, | The non-New Starts costs will be | | |
| | | | solution will lead to more | light rail was selected as the best | covered by a combination of | | |
| | | | traffic congestion, a more | transit technology option to best | funding sources, including sales | | |
| | | | dangerous community, a | serve the Durham-Orange Corridor | tax revenue generated in | | |
| | | | significant debt burden, | and to meet the Purpose and Need | Durham and Orange counties, | | |
| | | | and will be a blight on a | of the proposed transit project. The | funding from North Carolina | | |
| | | | beautiful community that | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | Department of Transportation | | |
| | | | took many years to build. | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | (NCDOT), and other local fees | | |
| | | | I stand firmly behind the | The Alternatives Analysis is available | and taxes. Triangle Transit will | | |
| | | | NO BUILD option | on ourtransitfuture.com. | also pursue Transportation | | |
| | | | | | Infrastructure Finance and | | |
| | | | | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit | | |
| | | | | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | assistance and possible | | |
| | | | | Project on the existing roadway | alternative financing and value | | |
| | | | | network and any measures | capture options. | | |
| | | | | recommended to mitigate such | | | |
| | | | | impacts. Technical reports that | | | |
| | | | | report the results of traffic | | | |
| | | | | simulations are included as | | | |
| | | | | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | | | |
| | | | | DEIS. | | | |
| | | | | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | | | |
| | | | | proposed mitigation measures that | | | |
| | | | | proposed miligation measures that | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Jane | Kirsch | Please stop spending good money on a bad idea. | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West Campus, Duke and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical | | | |
| N/G | Jane | Kirsch | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Mary Ann | Klompmaker | N/G | | | | |
| | Jay | Klompmaker | I believe this project is both unfeasible and unnecessary. | Comment Noted | | | |
| Title | FirstName | Surname | Comment | | | | |
| Mr | Daniel | Knoll | N/G | | | | |
| | Ann | Koerber | Just the noise levels are enough to show that this is a bad location for this industrial facility | As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|------------|-----------|-----------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | William | koerber | N/G | | | | |
| | Joseph | Koontz | N/G | | | | |
| | | Kumela | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Kathryn | Ladd | N/G | | | | |
| N/G N/G | | Lampe | The current plan for the Durham-Chapel Hill Light Rail Project does not go where anyone except a limited few medical personnel want to go. Raleigh planners already figured this out. To be useful to the general population, the route needs to go to RDU airport and on to Raleigh downtown. | Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be | | | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County. | | | |
| N/G | Fred | Lampe | N/G | , | | | |
| | Lilly | Langer | N/G | | | | |
| | David | Lapp | N/G | | | | |
| | Dana | Lapple | N/G | | | | |
| | Crystal | Lara | N/G | | | | |
| Mr. | James | Larkin | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| | 12 | | 11 1 1 2 1 1 | 0.7: 1.6 | A 1 11 DEIG 11 04 | | |
| Mr | Kenneth | Larsen | Light Rail is a complete | | As described in DEIS section 8.1 | | |
| | | | waste of money. It's too | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | and further explained in DEIS | | |
| | | | inflexible and will only | the year 2035. For more | chapter 1, the investment | | |
| | | | benefit people who live | information about ridership please | benefits of a project like the D-O | | |
| | | | · · | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | LRT include: improved mobility, | | |
| | | | station and whose | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | increased connectivity through | | |
| | | | destination is also within | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | expanded transit options, and | | |
| | | | a quarter mile of a | and Results Report. As noted in the | support of future development | | |
| | | | station. If you do the | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | |
| | | | math, that's a very small | region's existing transit network is | provide a competitive, reliable | | |
| | | | number of people. | currently operating at close to | alternative to automobile use | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | that supports compact | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | development. | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | Enhanced mobility will also | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | increase transit operating | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | efficiency: offer a competitive, | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | reliable transportation solution | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | that will reduce travel time. | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | Increased connectivity will | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | expand transit options between | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | Durham and Chapel Hill by | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | enhancing and seamlessly | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | connecting with the existing | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | transit system. | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | , | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | In addition, increased | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | connectivity will serve major | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | activity and employment centers | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | • | | |
| | | | | or me and activation residents and | the onlyersity of North Carolina | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/C | Sara | Lowson | This project should not | As described in DEIC section 9.1 and | CoTriangle foregasts on average | | |
| N/G | Sara | Larson | This project should not | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and | | | |
| | | | | further explained in DEIS chapter 1, | of 23,000 weekday light rail trips | | |
| | | | it will be used will not | the investment benefits of a project | l ' ' | | |
| | | | compensate for the | like the D-O LRT include: improved | information about ridership | | |
| | | | amount it will cost to | mobility, increased connectivity | please see DEIS Section 3.1: | | |
| | | | build or to compensate | through expanded transit options, | Public Transportation and DEIS | | |
| | | | for the | and support of future development | | | |
| | | | congestion/disruption to | plans. Enhanced mobility will | Methodology and Results Report. | | |
| | | | | provide a competitive, reliable | As noted in the Executive | | |
| | | | to those who live close to | alternative to automobile use that | Summary (ES-5), the region's | | |
| | | | the proposed route. | supports compact development. | existing transit network is | | |
| | | | | | currently operating at close to | | |
| | | | | Enhanced mobility will also increase | maximum capacity including 84 | | |
| | | | | transit operating efficiency: offer a | buses per hour servicing UNC | | |
| | | | | competitive, reliable transportation | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | |
| | | | | solution that will reduce travel time. | servicing Duke University and | | |
| | | | | Increased connectivity will expand | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | |
| | | | | transit options between Durham | Medical Centers. As further | | |
| | | | | and Chapel Hill by enhancing and | detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose | | |
| | | | | seamlessly connecting with the | and Need, this combination of | | |
| | | | | existing transit system. | bus routes that currently serve | | |
| | | | | , | the D-O Corridor and provide a | | |
| | | | | In addition, increased connectivity | high level of transit service | | |
| | | | | will serve major activity and | (Figure 1.5-2). However, there | | |
| | | | | employment centers between | are portions of the corridor | | |
| | | | | Durham and Chapel Hill: the | within Chapel Hill and between | | |
| | | | | University of North Carolina at | Duke and downtown Durham | | |
| | | | | Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, | where, due to congestion, adding | | |
| | | | | US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West | additional buses will not improve | | |
| | | | | Campus, Duke and Durham | service, as discussed further in | | |
| | | | | Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical | DEIS section 3.2. | | |
| | | | | veterans Arians (VA) ivieuical | DLIG SECTION 3.2. | | |

| safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails encoded the project. Durbam City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning environment. **Mr. Steve*** LeGardeur** **Mr. Steve*** **LeGardeur*** **Bread road crossings and placement of the ROMF in Detailed information regarding the benefits of a project. But the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to authorible use that supports compact development. **Wr. Steve**** **LeGardeur*** **Road road crossings and placement of the ROMF in Detailed information regarding the benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to authorible use that supports compact development. **Wr. Steve*** **LeGardeur*** **N/G*** **John Type of the Basis for plans the Parket of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to authorible use that supports compact development. **Wr. Steve*** **LeGardeur** **N/G*** **Detail Champer of the Basis for plans the Rance of the Basis for plans the Rance of the Basis for plans the Rance of mobility, micreased connectivity will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce the existing transit system. **In addition, increased connectivity will seven major activity and empty of the existing transit system. **In addition, increased connectivity will seven major activity and empty of the Portham and Chapel Hill the Univer | Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|--|-------|-----------|-----------|--|---|--|------------|------------|
| connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina Mr. Steve LeGardeur N/G | | | | I agree that cost and safety issues, especially at grade road crossings and placement of the ROMF in a residential community, are not adequately addressed to continue forward with this light rail project. Durham City and County would better spend their contributions in repairing their poorly maintained and moldy schools to assure our vulnerable school age children a safe and healthy learning | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. | Response 3 | Response 4 |
| | Mr. | Steve | LeGardeur | N/G | | connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: | | |
| (NIS TREGGY THE PROPERTY IN IN INTERPRETATION TO THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY | | Peggy | Leggett | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| N 4+ | Frederick | Leitner | Cost too laws for too | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and | | | |
| Mt | Frederick | Leither | Cost too large for too | | | | |
| | | | little positive value | further explained in DEIS chapter 1, | | | |
| | | | | the investment benefits of a project | | | |
| | | | | like the D-O LRT include: improved | | | |
| | | | | mobility, increased connectivity | | | |
| | | | | through expanded transit options, | | | |
| | | | | and support of future development | | | |
| | | | | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | | |
| | | | | provide a competitive, reliable | | | |
| | | | | alternative to automobile use that | | | |
| | | | | supports compact development. | | | |
| | | | | Enhanced mobility will also increase | | | |
| | | | | transit operating efficiency: offer a | | | |
| | | | | competitive, reliable transportation | | | |
| | | | | solution that will reduce travel time. | | | |
| | | | | Increased connectivity will expand | | | |
| | | | | transit options between Durham | | | |
| | | | | and Chapel Hill by enhancing and | | | |
| | | | | seamlessly connecting with the | | | |
| | | | | existing transit system. | | | |
| | | | | In addition, increased connectivity | | | |
| | | | | will serve major activity and | | | |
| | | | | employment centers between | | | |
| | | | | Durham and Chapel Hill: the | | | |
| | | | | University of North Carolina at | | | |
| | | | | Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, | | | |
| | | | | US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West | | | |
| | | | | Campus, Duke and Durham | | | |
| | | | | Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical | | | |
| | | | | veteralis Alialis (VA) Medical | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Ms | Bernice | Leitner | Too much money for | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and | | | |
| | | | unclear and disruptive | further explained in DEIS chapter 1, | | | |
| | | | Benefit | the investment benefits of a project | | | |
| | | | | like the D-O LRT include: improved | | | |
| | | | | mobility, increased connectivity | | | |
| | | | | through expanded transit options, | | | |
| | | | | and support of future development | | | |
| | | | | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | | |
| | | | | provide a competitive, reliable | | | |
| | | | | alternative to automobile use that | | | |
| | | | | supports compact development. | | | |
| | | | | Enhanced mobility will also increase | | | |
| | | | | transit operating efficiency: offer a | | | |
| | | | | competitive, reliable transportation | | | |
| | | | | solution that will reduce travel time. | | | |
| | | | | Increased connectivity will expand | | | |
| | | | | transit options between Durham | | | |
| | | | | and Chapel Hill by enhancing and | | | |
| | | | | seamlessly connecting with the | | | |
| | | | | existing transit system. | | | |
| | | | | In addition, increased connectivity | | | |
| | | | | will serve major activity and | | | |
| | | | | employment centers between | | | |
| | | | | Durham and Chapel Hill: the | | | |
| | | | | University of North Carolina at | | | |
| | | | | Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, | | | |
| | | | | US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West | | | |
| | | | | Campus, Duke and Durham | | | |
| | | | | Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical | | | |
| Mr. | Robert | Leopold | N/G | | | | |
| Mrs | Ingeborg | Leopold | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | John | Lewis | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Ms. | Melanie | Leyden | This is residential, | As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and | • | While the Cornwallis Road ROMF | |
| | | | | 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at | | alternative would result in fewer | |
| | | | | the Farrington Road site will require | | overall impacts to water | |
| | | | three local schools, and | land use entitlements including a | NEPA Preferred Alternative was | resources as compared to the | |
| | | | | comprehensive plan amendment | selected and why the other | NEPA Preferred Alternative site | |
| | | | is not the place for a 24 | and rezoning. | alternatives were eliminated | (Farrington Road), the Cornwallis | |
| | | | hour maintenance facility. | It is expected that the City and/or | from consideration. The | Road ROMF Alternative may | |
| | | | It is absolutely unfair to | County of Durham will place | Farrington Road ROMF | result in adverse impacts to | |
| | | | the property owners in | conditions on the approvals that | Alternative is included in the | community resources (The Levin | |
| | | | this area to rezone and | appropriate mitigation measures | NEPA Preferred Alternative. | Jewish Community Center, Lerner | |
| | | | create this facility. People | are included in the design, including | In summary, the Farrington Road | Community Day School, Carter | |
| | | | invested in this | strategies to complement the | ROMF Alternative site is the most | Community Charter School, and | |
| | | | neighborhood because of | surrounding context such as use of | desirable from a construction | Judea Reform Congregation) and | |
| | | | its county setting. | architectural styles and/or | and operations standpoint. It is a | a higher constructability cost. In | |
| | | | Disrupting existing | landscape design. | 25-acre site, the largest site of | addition, the NEPA Preferred | |
| | | | neighborhoods is unjust | During Engineering, Triangle Transit | the alternatives considered. The | Alternative would allow for a | |
| | | | when there are better | will continue to coordinate with | Farrington Road ROMF site is | superior yard layout from an | |
| | | | location available that are | property owners and residents near | located on a long straight section | operational perspective, whereas | |
| | | | already zoned for | the site to develop and refine these | of track which accommodates | the Cornwallis Road ROMF site | |
| | | | industrial endeavors; | strategies. The public will also have | cross-overs for access to the | would require operational | |
| | | | Corwallis! | the opportunity to comment on the | yard. The site is reasonably flat, | compromises, which would result | |
| | | | | design through a public hearing as | making preparation of the site | in higher operational and | |
| | | | | part of the City and/or County | for construction easier. Effective | maintenance costs (section | |
| | | | | approval process. | screening buffers can be | 8.2.2.2). | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, | provided around the site. The | | |
| | | | | no noise impacts are anticipated at | largest land owner on the site | | |
| | | | | the Farrington ROMF. Section | has expressed support for the | | |
| | | | | 4.4.3.1 states lighting would be | Farrington Road ROMF | | |
| | | | | aimed towards the ROMF to reduce | Alternative. The site would have | | |
| | | | | spillage onto neighboring properties | no effects to historic resources. | | |
| | | | | and adjacent roadways. In addition, | The Farrington Road ROMF | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | joseph & | liegl | Ridership seems unlikely | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | Many communities across the | | |
| , 0 | ianet | | 1 | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | country are implementing or | | |
| | , | | · - | the year 2035. For more | extending light rail transit | | |
| | | | | information about ridership please | systems because of the long term | | |
| | | | | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | value and opportunities which | | |
| | | | and home values. | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | they bring to businesses, home | | |
| | | | | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | owners, and people of all | | |
| | | | | and Results Report. As noted in the | | | |
| | | | | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | learning, and traveling along light | | |
| | | | | region's existing transit network is | rail corridors. Studies of light rail | | |
| | | | | currently operating at close to | projects around the country have | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | shown a positive impact on | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | a station, cloeset to the improved | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | transportation service. | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | • | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | residential property value | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | premiums of 3%-40% were | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | observed in rail station areas. In | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | Charlotte, a study of single-family | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | home prices indicated increased | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | value of properties close to light | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | rail stations relative to properties | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | farther from stations after | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | opening of the LYNX Blue Line | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | light rail. | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | - | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | | |
| Dr | Jason | Liss | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Henry | Lister | Please reiect route C2 and | The Town of Chapel Hill requested | The C1A Alternative has the | | |
| | , | | | | longest length of the Little Creek | | |
| | | | through Meadowmont, | alignments be studied as part of the | | | |
| | | | | Alternatives Analysis for the Project. | | | |
| | | | | | ridership of the Little Creek | | |
| | | | | developed the C2 alignments as part | Alternatives. In terms of impacts | | |
| | | | | of the Alternatives Analysis. In | to the natural environment, the | | |
| | | | | February 2012, the Durham-Chapel | C1A Alternative would impact | | |
| | | | | Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning | undisturbed forested areas and | | |
| | | | | Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted | wetlands associated with Little | | |
| | | | | the proposed D-O LRT Project, | Creek, in particular, the Little | | |
| | | | | including both the C1 and C2 | Creek Bottomlands and Slopes | | |
| | | | | alignment corridors. | Significant Natural Heritage Area | | |
| | | | | | on the periphery of the USACE- | | |
| | | | | The Town of Chapel Hill expressed | owned property. | | |
| | | | | its preference for an alignment | | | |
| | | | | running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A | Therefore, as compared to the | | |
| | | | | Alternatives) that would be more | NEPA Preferred Alternative (C2A) | | |
| | | | | supportive of planned future | and the other alternatives, the | | |
| | | | | growth than C1 and C1A | C1A Alternative would not | | |
| | | | | Alternatives. These alternatives | minimize adverse impacts to the | | |
| | | | | would result in a conversion of less | natural environment or use and | | |
| | | | | dense land uses into higher density | enhance existing and | | |
| | | | | uses near stations. These impacts | underutilized transportation | | |
| | | | | are considered beneficial and | rights-of-way. | | |
| | | | | consistent with local planning. | | | |
| | | | | | The evaluation of the NEPA | | |
| | | | | The C1 Alternative would impact | Preferred Alternative and all | | |
| | | | | undisturbed natural areas including | Project Element Alternatives are | | |
| | | | | the Little Creek Bottomlands and | included in the DEIS and are | | |
| | | | | Slopes Significant Natural Heritage | summarized in DEIS chapter 8, | | |
| N/G | K | Liu | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Qi | Liu | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Brodie | Lloyd | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Ms. | Ann | Loftin | What might make more | Various transit technologies were | Planning for high-capacity transit | | |
| 1015. | Allii | LOIGIII | l ~ | previously studied and evaluated in | in the Triangle region began | | |
| | | | sense, in my view, is a | [' | 0 0 0 | | |
| | | | trolley along the middle | an extensive public process called | more than 20 years ago, and a | | |
| | | | of 15/501, all the way | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | number of studies have been | | |
| | | | from Durham to Chapel | Technologies considered during the | | | |
| | | | Hill. It could go up | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, | | | |
| | | | Franklin, which would | Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), | including extensive coordination | | |
| | | | benefit from becoming a | and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | with stakeholders and members | | |
| | | | two-lane street again. Or | Through the Alternatives Analysis, | of the public to develop, | | |
| | | | along 54 and up to the | light rail was selected as the best | evaluate, and refine the range of | | |
| | | | hospital. Or both. And we | transit technology option to best | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The | | |
| | | | need public | serve the Durham-Orange Corridor | key studies, white papers, and | | |
| | | | transportation from | and to meet the Purpose and Need | reports that identified the need | | |
| | | | • | of the proposed transit project. The | for high-capacity transit in the | | |
| | | | • | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | · , , | | |
| | | | or rail. | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | _ | | |
| | | | or run. | The Alternatives Analysis is available | | | |
| | | | | on ourtransitfuture.com. | indicate that the estimated | | |
| | | | | on ourtransitruture.com. | demand for a continuously | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | connected rail line to RDU and | | |
| | | | | | RTP is not warranted or cost | | |
| | | | | | effective for the Project. | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|---------------|-----------|---|---|---|------------|------------|
| Mr. | Johnny | Long | Orange Light Rail project and pursue more cost effective alternatives that will meet the long term needs of the region. This route will be detrimental to the value and quality of living for homes and residents of Falconbridge/Huntingbrid ge, Downing Creek, Homes along Barbee Chapel Road, Chapelwood, and other areas along N.C. 54 East | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The | transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 | | |
| Mrs | Joan | Long | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Martin | Lopez | This project is totally unnecessary. The majority of taxpayers affected do not want it. Put it to a vote. | Comment Noted | | | |
| N/G | Carter | Love | N/G | | | - | |
| N/G | Michael David | Loven | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | James | Lowe | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Carmen | Lowe | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Louchie | Lu | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|----------|-------------|--------------|---|--|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Aaron | Lubeck | N/G | | | | |
| MR | Clark | Luikart | N/G | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Ms Mx | Jean Bob | Lusted Lynch | N/G LR would be ok, but Rapid Bus Transit, (RBT) is much, much better. Also 1/2 the cost. | Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | | | |
| N/G | Lianne | MacGregor | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Ridwan | Mahbub | We don't need this train | Various transit technologies were | The Triangle region has | | |
| | | | | previously studied and evaluated in | experienced extraordinary | | |
| | | | ' | an extensive public process called | growth in recent years. Growth | | |
| | | | public transportation | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | forecasts show population in the | | |
| | | | system and a triangle- | Technologies considered during the | region increasing by 80 percent | | |
| | | | wide bus system that | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, | between 2010 and 2040, from | | |
| | | | does an effective job of | Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), | 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O | | |
| | | | taking away residents. | and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | Corridor, the population is | | |
| | | | This costly train serves no | Through the Alternatives Analysis, | projected to double and the | | |
| | | | real purpose and may | light rail was selected as the best | highest expected travel intensity | | |
| | | | have unintended | transit technology option to best | (number of trips per acre) in the | | |
| | | | consequences like | serve the Durham-Orange Corridor | Triangle region is predominately | | |
| | | | bringing in crime, noise, | and to meet the Purpose and Need | located in this corridor. | | |
| | | | quality of life, etc. It is | of the proposed transit project. The | | | |
| | | | unlikely the train will go | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | Even under current demands, the | | |
| | | | everywhere we want it to. | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | region's transportation system is | | |
| | | | | The Alternatives Analysis is available | beginning to strain. Levels of | | |
| | | | | on ourtransitfuture.com. | congestion are increasing and are | | |
| | | | | | anticipated to worsen, which will | | |
| | | | | | lead to increased travel times | | |
| | | | | | and the continuation of | | |
| | | | | | automobile-oriented | | |
| | | | | | development patterns. The | | |
| | | | | | region's explosive growth is also | | |
| | | | | | outpacing the ability to repair, | | |
| | | | | | replace and expand the existing | | |
| | | | | | roadway network. Considering | | |
| | | | | | financial and environmental | | |
| | | | | | issues, simply increasing highway | | |
| | | | | | capacity to meet these demands | | |
| | | | | | is no longer a viable option (ES- | | |
| Mr | Josh | Manchester | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|------------|------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Michael | Mangili | I haliava the project is not | Planning for high-capacity transit in | Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents | | |
| IN/ G | iviiciiaei | ivialigiii | | the Triangle region began more | the evaluation of ROMF | | |
| | | | Triangle. I was in favor | than 20 years ago, and a number of | alternatives and explains why the | | |
| | | | with Wake Co. involved | studies have been conducted to | NEPA Preferred Alternative was | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | • | advance major transit investments | selected and why the other | | |
| | | | | in the area, including extensive | alternatives were eliminated | | |
| | | | a residential area and | coordination with stakeholders and | from consideration. The | | |
| | | | located to closely to an | members of the public to develop, | Farrington Road ROMF | | |
| | | | elementary school. It is | evaluate, and refine the range of | Alternative is included in the | | |
| | | | going to lead to more | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | NEPA Preferred Alternative. | | |
| | | | headaches! | studies, white papers, and reports | In summary, the Farrington Road | | |
| | | | | that identified the need for high- | ROMF Alternative site is the most | | |
| | | | | capacity transit in the region and | desirable from a construction | | |
| | | | | defined the D-O Corridor are | and operations standpoint. It is a | | |
| | | | | summarized in Section 2.1. These | 25-acre site, the largest site of | | |
| | | | | past studies indicate that the | the alternatives considered. The | | |
| | | | | estimated demand for a | Farrington Road ROMF site is | | |
| | | | | continuously connected rail line to | located on a long straight section | | |
| | | | | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | of track which accommodates | | |
| | | | | cost effective for the Project. | cross-overs for access to the | | |
| | | | | RTP has a significant number of | yard. The site is reasonably flat, | | |
| | | | | jobs, but they are widely distributed | making preparation of the site | | |
| | | | | and dispersed compared to Chapel | for construction easier. Effective | | |
| | | | | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | screening buffers can be | | |
| | | | | development pattern is not as | provided around the site. The | | |
| | | | | conducive to rail. | largest land owner on the site | | |
| | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | has expressed support for the | | |
| | | | | currently evaluating future potential | Farrington Road ROMF | | |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be | Alternative. The site would have | | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is | no effects to historic resources. | | |
| | | | | secured for transit in Wake County. | The Farrington Road ROMF | | |
| Dr | Arun | Manikumar | N/G | , | - | | |
| Ms. | Kristi | Mann | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Kelly | Mansfield | N/G | | | | |
| _ | Raquel | Maradiaga | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|
| Mr. | Luis | Maradiaga | Rail Train is unnecessary and will be underused. We already have a working bus system for public transportation. | GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and | | | |
| N/G | Bonita | Marks | | Comment Noted | | | |
| N/G | Maria | Marquis | N/G | | | | |
| Mrs. | М | Mars | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | mary | mars | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|---------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Mr | James | Mars | N/G | | | | |
| mr | wayne | marshall | Stop it now! | Comment Noted | | | |
| | lesley | marson | N/G | Comment Noted | | | |
| | Caroline | Mason | Do NOT want to see the | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | Littlejohn Road is a three-legged | | |
| IVII 3. | Caronne | IVIGSOTI | access to 54/Little John | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | unsignalized intersections with | | |
| | | | Road CLOSED! Too many | Project on the existing roadway | turning volumes below 115 | | |
| | | | people use it. | network and any measures | | | |
| | | | people use it. | | vehicles per hour for all | | |
| | | | | recommended to mitigate such | movements from or to these | | |
| | | | | impacts. Technical reports that | roadways during the weekday | | |
| | | | | report the results of traffic | AM and PM peak hours. The | | |
| | | | | simulations are included as | majority of volumes turning onto | | |
| | | | | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | or exiting these roadways are | | |
| | | | | DEIS. | below 60 vehicles per hour. The | | |
| | | | | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | highest turning volumes at these | | |
| | | | | proposed mitigation measures that | locations are right turns that are | | |
| | | | | are planned to mitigate for project- | stop controlled. The intersection | | |
| | | | | related roadway effects. These | does not meet the minimum | | |
| | | | | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | volume conditions for a signal | | |
| | | | | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | warrant, which would be | | |
| | | | | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | required to install signals. The | | |
| | | | | roadway project planned by the | intersection will operate with the | | |
| | | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | gates up or open Littlejohn Road | | |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | for 90% of the peak hours and | | |
| | | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | this percentage will increase | | |
| | | | | continue to coordinate with the | during off-peak hours when | | |
| | | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | there are fewer trains. | | |
| | | | | projects advance. | | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | | | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------|---|---|------------|------------|------------|
| Ms | Laurin | Massengale | believe the Meadowmont location will get better ridership and interfere with traffic less than the C2A route. | The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas including the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage | | | |
| N/G | Shelley | Masters | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Marianna | Matinyan | I find the project utterly unnecessary . | Comment Noted | | | |
| N/G | Pamela | Mayer | N/G | | | | |
| | · | Mayer | No thank you! Please do not put the stop here | Comment Noted | | | |
| | david | mayer | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Rebecca | Mayew | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Kathleen | McAndrews | We do not need a 17 mile | Planning for high-capacity transit in | As described in DEIS section 8.1 | | |
| | | | bridge to no where. It | the Triangle region began more | and further explained in DEIS | | |
| | | | doesn't even go to RTP, | than 20 years ago, and a number of | chapter 1, the investment | | |
| | | | the airport or Raleigh. It | studies have been conducted to | benefits of a project like the D-O | | |
| | | | cost billions of dollars | advance major transit investments | LRT include: improved mobility, | | |
| | | | with not much value. | in the area, including extensive | increased connectivity through | | |
| | | | Raleigh gave up on this | coordination with stakeholders and | expanded transit options, and | | |
| | | | idea because it made no | members of the public to develop, | support of future development | | |
| | | | sense. We should do so | evaluate, and refine the range of | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | |
| | | | as well. Please cancel | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | provide a competitive, reliable | | |
| | | | this. | studies, white papers, and reports | alternative to automobile use | | |
| | | | | that identified the need for high- | that supports compact | | |
| | | | | capacity transit in the region and | development. | | |
| | | | | defined the D-O Corridor are | | | |
| | | | | summarized in Section 2.1. These | Enhanced mobility will also | | |
| | | | | past studies indicate that the | increase transit operating | | |
| | | | | estimated demand for a | efficiency: offer a competitive, | | |
| | | | | continuously connected rail line to | reliable transportation solution | | |
| | | | | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | that will reduce travel time. | | |
| | | | | cost effective for the Project. | Increased connectivity will | | |
| | | | | RTP has a significant number of | expand transit options between | | |
| | | | | jobs, but they are widely distributed | Durham and Chapel Hill by | | |
| | | | | and dispersed compared to Chapel | enhancing and seamlessly | | |
| | | | | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | connecting with the existing | | |
| | | | | development pattern is not as | transit system. | | |
| | | | | conducive to rail. | | | |
| | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | In addition, increased | | |
| | | | | currently evaluating future potential | connectivity will serve major | | |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be | activity and employment centers | | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is | between Durham and Chapel Hill: | | |
| | | | | secured for transit in Wake County. | the University of North Carolina | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|---|--|------------|------------|
| Ms | Renee | McBride | RDU, RTP and Southpoint should be served, and it should extend farther east and north in Durham to serve members of those communities (of which I am one). Serving Carrboro and | Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential | Extensions of the project, including those to Carrboro and Hillsborough, are not precluded as part of this project. Such projects, if studied, would be done so under a separate NEPA process. | Response 3 | Response 4 |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County. | | | |
| N/G | Julie | McBrierty | N/G | , | | | |
| | Mike | McBrierty | N/G | | | | |
| | S. G. | McCain | N/G | | | | |
| | Debbie | McCarthy | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|
| N/G | D. C. | McCarthy | This is an ill-conceived | Section 4.8.3.1 discusses | As described in DEIS section | Section 4.4.3.1 states that for | |
| , | | | plan. It will aid to the | groundwater quality and states that | 4.10.4, no noise impacts are | visual impacts Triangle Transit | |
| | | | destruction of a rural | the 116 privately –owned wells that | · ' | will use interdisciplinary design | |
| | | | buffer between Durham | are within 1,500 feet of the D-O | ROMF. DEIS section 4.10.4 and | teams to create aesthetics | |
| | | | and Chapel Hill and is not | Corridor would not be affected by | table 4.10-6 provides a summary | guidelines and stands in the | |
| | | | | the operation of the light rail | of the noise and vibration | design of project element s and | |
| | | | As usual the construction, | vehicles because the vehicles do not | impacts for the alternatives. For | provide landscaping and | |
| | | | long term water and air | have gasoline or oils that could spill | the proposed D-O LRT Project, it | aesthetic treatments with in | |
| | | | pollution, and the noise | and contaminate the groundwater. | is anticipated that severe noise | close proximity to residences. | |
| | | | impacts will be on the | In addition, the use of concrete ties | impacts would occur at one | | |
| | | | citizens of Durham Co. | avoids the environmental issue of | location and moderate noise | | |
| | | | thus maintaining the | leaching creosote from wood ties. | impacts would occur at four | | |
| | | | character of Chapel Hill. | The addition of impervious surfaces, | locations with the NEPA | | |
| | | | The water runoff from | particularly at the park-and-rides | Preferred Alternative. Vibration | | |
| | | | this facility and the noise | lots, ROMF, and stations, would | impacts would occur at 8 | | |
| | | | and the ugliness are not | require the implementation of best | receptors and ground-borne | | |
| | | | something Durham | management practices for the | noise impacts would occur at 13 | | |
| | | | residents want. | collection and treatment of | receptors with the NEPA | | |
| | | | | stormwater runoff. | Preferred Alternative. Other | | |
| | | | | | alternative alignments would | | |
| | | | | | result in some additional impacts | | |
| | | | | | at receptors, but the number of | | |
| | | | | | additional impact locations is not | | |
| | | | | | substantial. None of the ROMF | | |
| | | | | | sites would result in noise or | | |
| | | | | | vibration impacts. | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Figures 4.10-6 through 4.10-9 | | |
| | | | | | illustrate the locations of | | |
| | | | | | receptors that would be | | |
| | | | | | impacted by the NEPA Preferred | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|------------------|-------------------|---|---|------------|------------|------------|
| Mrs. | Kathy | McCord | resources because it will not benefit the people who need transportation. | The D-O LRT Project would benefit transit-dependent populations by providing increased mobility and improved access and connectivity. The Light Rail Alternative would serve as a spine to link the residential growth with new employment opportunities in the D-O Corridor. A discussion of potential impacts to minority and low-income populations is provided in detail in DEIS chapter 5. As listed in Table 4.2-4, the proposed station areas of the NEPA Preferred Alternative would serve approximately 53,000 residents, 25,800 households, and employment of 119,100, in 2040. The NEPA Preferred Alternative would also serve over 13,000 transit dependent persons living within ½-mile of the stations, as well as a LEP population of over 2,600. | | | |
| | Timothy Diane | McCord McElroy | N/G N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Dr. | Diane | McGrath | This plan will create | Parking is proposed at several | | | |
| | 2.00 | | significant problems as | stations as described in DEIS section | | | |
| | | | well as very significant | 3.3. As described in Table 2.3-2 and | | | |
| | | | unintended | further detailed in Table 3.3-2, park- | | | |
| | | | consequences. For | and-ride facilities are currently | | | |
| | | | example the station for | planned at the following stations: | | | |
| | | | Woodmont has no | Friday Center | | | |
| | | | parking spaces and the | • Leigh Village | | | |
| | | | projected numbers for | Gateway | | | |
| | | | use are fantasy not fact. | MLK Jr. Parkway | | | |
| | | | , | • South Square | | | |
| | | | | • Durham | | | |
| | | | | Dillard Street | | | |
| | | | | Alston Avenue | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | The number of parking spaces | | | |
| | | | | proposed varies and are based on | | | |
| | | | | forecasted ridership and land | | | |
| | | | | availability. Stations with park-and- | | | |
| | | | | ride facilities would include bus bays | | | |
| | | | | for connecting feeder bus routes | | | |
| | | | | and "kiss-and-ride" spaces for | | | |
| | | | | passenger pick-up and drop-off. | | | |
| | | | | Walk-up stations would be accessed | | | |
| | | | | primarily by pedestrians, bicyclists, | | | |
| | | | | and passengers transferring from | | | |
| | | | | bus service. In general, automobile | | | |
| | | | | parking would not be provided at | | | |
| | | | | walk-up stations (section 2.3.2.1). | | | |
| | | | | See also typical images on p.2-23 | | | |
| | | | | and conceptual designs in appendix | | | |
| Ms | Chris | McHugh | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Philip | McHugh | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Scott | McIlhenny | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Ingrid | McIntosh | The Farrington Road | As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and | Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents | | |
| 14, 0 | III BII I | Wichitosh | _ | 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at | · | | |
| | | | | the Farrington Road site will require | | | |
| | | | destroy our 55 plus | land use entitlements including a | NEPA Preferred Alternative was | | |
| | | | | comprehensive plan amendment | selected and why the other | | |
| | | | of an industrial area in | and rezoning. | alternatives were eliminated | | |
| | | | our rural, quiet | It is expected that the City and/or | from consideration. The | | |
| | | | community will | County of Durham will place | Farrington Road ROMF | | |
| | | | significantly lower our | conditions on the approvals that | Alternative is included in the | | |
| | | | | appropriate mitigation measures | NEPA Preferred Alternative. | | |
| | | | local crime and threaten | are included in the design, including | | | |
| | | | the financial andn | strategies to complement the | ROMF Alternative site is the most | | |
| | | | physical security of our | surrounding context such as use of | desirable from a construction | | |
| | | | senior citizens in this | architectural styles and/or | and operations standpoint. It is a | | |
| | | | area. | , | 25-acre site, the largest site of | | |
| | | | | During Engineering, Triangle Transit | | | |
| | | | | will continue to coordinate with | Farrington Road ROMF site is | | |
| | | | | property owners and residents near | _ | | |
| | | | | the site to develop and refine these | of track which accommodates | | |
| | | | | strategies. The public will also have | cross-overs for access to the | | |
| | | | | the opportunity to comment on the | yard. The site is reasonably flat, | | |
| | | | | design through a public hearing as | making preparation of the site | | |
| | | | | part of the City and/or County | for construction easier. Effective | | |
| | | | | approval process. | screening buffers can be | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, | provided around the site. The | | |
| | | | | no noise impacts are anticipated at | largest land owner on the site | | |
| | | | | the Farrington ROMF. Section | has expressed support for the | | |
| | | | | 4.4.3.1 states lighting would be | Farrington Road ROMF | | |
| | | | | aimed towards the ROMF to reduce | Alternative. The site would have | | |
| | | | | spillage onto neighboring properties | no effects to historic resources. | | |
| | | | | and adjacent roadways. In addition, | The Farrington Road ROMF | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|--------------|----------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| NI/C | James | McIntosh | Location of maintenance | Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the | | | |
| IN/ G | Jairies | IVICIIILOSII | facility near school & our | evaluation of ROMF alternatives and | | | |
| | | | 55 plus community and | explains why the NEPA Preferred | | | |
| | | | other residential areas. | i i | | | |
| | | | other residential areas. | Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were | | | |
| | | | | eliminated from consideration. The | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is | | | |
| | | | | included in the NEPA Preferred | | | |
| | | | | Alternative. | | | |
| | | | | In summary, the Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative site is the most | | | |
| | | | | desirable from a construction and | | | |
| | | | | operations standpoint. It is a 25- | | | |
| | | | | acre site, the largest site of the | | | |
| | | | | alternatives considered. The | | | |
| | | | | Farrington Road ROMF site is | | | |
| | | | | located on a long straight section of | | | |
| | | | | track which accommodates cross- | | | |
| | | | | overs for access to the yard. The site | | | |
| | | | | is reasonably flat, making | | | |
| | | | | preparation of the site for | | | |
| | | | | construction easier. Effective | | | |
| | | | | screening buffers can be provided | | | |
| | | | | around the site. The largest land | | | |
| | | | | owner on the site has expressed | | | |
| | | | | support for the Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative. The site would | | | |
| | | | | have no effects to historic | | | |
| | | | | resources. The Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative also has the | | | |
| | | | | lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Mrc | Kathleen | McManus | Because of the already | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | | | |
| 14113 | Katiliceli | IVICIVIAITAS | · · | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | | | |
| | | | along this route, adding | Project on the existing roadway | | | |
| | | | more stops will only | network and any measures | | | |
| | | | increase the problems. | recommended to mitigate such | | | |
| | | | · · | impacts. Technical reports that | | | |
| | | | not proven to benefit | report the results of traffic | | | |
| | | | municipalities and | simulations are included as | | | |
| | | | consumer satisfaction. | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | | | |
| | | | consumer satisfaction. | DEIS. | | | |
| | | | | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | | | |
| | | | | proposed mitigation measures that | | | |
| | | | | are planned to mitigate for project- | | | |
| | | | | related roadway effects. These | | | |
| | | | | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | | | |
| | | | | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | | | |
| | | | | roadway project planned by the | | | |
| | | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | | | |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | | | |
| | | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | | | |
| | | | | continue to coordinate with the | | | |
| | | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | | | |
| | | | | projects advance. | | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | | | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Hannah | Meador | Properties on | The Town of Chapel Hill requested | | | |
| | | | , | that alternatives to the C1 | | | |
| | | | in the rest of the | alignments be studied as part of the | | | |
| | | | | Alternatives Analysis for the Project. | | | |
| | | | purchased with the full | As a result, the Project team | | | |
| | | | disclosure of future light | developed the C2 alignments as part | | | |
| | | | , , , | of the Alternatives Analysis. In | | | |
| | | | | February 2012, the Durham-Chapel | | | |
| | | | l' | Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning | | | |
| | | | fact 13 years ago when | Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted | | | |
| | | | building a house in | the proposed D-O LRT Project, | | | |
| | | | Meadowmont. The basis | including both the C1 and C2 | | | |
| | | | for altering these plans | alignment corridors. | | | |
| | | | seems nonsensical, | | | | |
| | | | biased, and not in keeping | The Town of Chapel Hill expressed | | | |
| | | | with Chapel Hill's | its preference for an alignment | | | |
| | | | reputation for thoughtful | running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A | | | |
| | | | long-term planning in the | Alternatives) that would be more | | | |
| | | | interest of the community | supportive of planned future | | | |
| | | | as a whole. | growth than C1 and C1A | | | |
| | | | | Alternatives. These alternatives | | | |
| | | | | would result in a conversion of less | | | |
| | | | | dense land uses into higher density | | | |
| | | | | uses near stations. These impacts | | | |
| | | | | are considered beneficial and | | | |
| | | | | consistent with local planning. | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | The C1 Alternative would impact | | | |
| | | | | undisturbed natural areas including | | | , |
| | | | | the Little Creek Bottomlands and | | | |
| | | | | Slopes Significant Natural Heritage | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|---|---|---|------------|
| N/G | Judith | Mellyn | the selection of light rail and its preferred route | Triangle Transit has a robust public outreach approach for the D-O LRT Project, the details of which are included in Chapter 9. | by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there | behalf of the Federal Transit Administration as well as GoTriangle. The DEIS was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as well as Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21); Environmental Impact and Related Procedures of 1987 [23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 771]; Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation (USDOT) Act of 1966 [49 U.S.C. § 303] and [23 CFR § 774]; and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1977 [33 U.S.C. § 1251], among others. A legal sufficiency review of the DEIS was also conducted by the FTA and Triangle Transit. | |
| Mrs | Marcia | Mensah | N/G | | | | |
| | Roger | Messier | There are better ways to spend text dollars. Z | Comment Noted | | | |
| | Caroline | Mikaloff | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | June | Milby | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Mr. | Norbert | Mildner | | Planning for high-capacity transit in | Various transit technologies were | | |
| | | | ' ' | the Triangle region began more | previously studied and evaluated | , , | |
| | | | | than 20 years ago, and a number of | | Project is fully advanced through | |
| | | | ' | studies have been conducted to | | the New Starts process, it is | |
| | | | travel is very insufficient, | advance major transit investments | (AA). Technologies considered | anticipated that the New Starts | |
| | | | does not go to airport, big | in the area, including extensive | during the AA included: | program will provide | |
| | | | mall's, stadium. Charlotte, | coordination with stakeholders and | | approximately 50 percent of the | |
| | | | which is 3 x as big as | members of the public to develop, | Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail | D-O LRT Project's capital cost. | |
| | | | chapel hill does not cover | evaluate, and refine the range of | Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail | The non-New Starts costs will be | |
| | | | the cost yet, means | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | Transit (CRT). Through the | covered by a combination of | |
| | | | taxpayer still has to | studies, white papers, and reports | Alternatives Analysis, light rail | funding sources, including sales | |
| | | | support the project. | that identified the need for high- | was selected as the best transit | tax revenue generated in Durham | |
| | | | By the time the LR is built | capacity transit in the region and | technology option to best serve | and Orange counties, funding | |
| | | | the technology is | defined the D-O Corridor are | the Durham-Orange Corridor and | from North Carolina Department | |
| | | | outdated. There are | summarized in Section 2.1. These | to meet the Purpose and Need of | of Transportation (NCDOT), and | |
| | | | better alternatives to | past studies indicate that the | the proposed transit project. The | other local fees and taxes. | |
| | | | meat the proposed | estimated demand for a | findings of the Alternatives | Triangle Transit will also pursue | |
| | | | demand for the CH area. | continuously connected rail line to | Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 | Transportation Infrastructure | |
| | | | The maintenance | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | of the DEIS. The Alternatives | Finance and Innovation Act | |
| | | | , upkeep safety issue are | cost effective for the Project. | Analysis is available on | (TIFIA) credit assistance and | |
| | | | Oslo a big concern. | RTP has a significant number of | ourtransitfuture.com. | possible alternative financing and | |
| | | | | jobs, but they are widely distributed | | value capture options. | |
| | | | | and dispersed compared to Chapel | | | |
| | | | | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | | | |
| | | | | development pattern is not as | | | |
| | | | | conducive to rail. | | | |
| | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | | | |
| | | | | currently evaluating future potential | | | |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be | | | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is | | | |
| | | | | secured for transit in Wake County. | | | |
| mr. | Norbertt | Mildner | L | Comment Noted | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|---------------------|-----------|---|--|---|---|------------|
| | | Miles | I do not think the light rail is a good idea for several reason. I rode the light rail in Baltimore for five years (starting with first year). I would be surprised if this saves money and created jobs. I only saw the crime on the light rail and the communities it brought crime to. I also do not think any light rail is truly | The proposed D-O LRT Project would be designed and operated in accordance with Triangle Transit's current safety and security plans. These plans would be updated to include specific requirements for the NEPA Preferred and Project Element alternatives, reviewed by FTA, and submitted through the NCDOT State Safety Oversight process for approval prior to revenue service. Triangle Transit uses Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) | The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 | Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all | Response 4 |
| | | | money. I also do not see why Meadowmont can say no they do not want it after the decision was made to have it. I feel that you are just putting across the street because we do not have the money to fight it and the Finley Forest community will only be hurt more, with the home values decreasing. | Environmental Design (CPTED) concepts to assist in deterring criminal activity in the design of its facilities. The basic principle of CPTED is to increase natural surveillance by providing good sightlines and avoiding conditions such as tall landscaping that could potentially provide individuals with areas to hide or obstruct mechanical methods of surveillance, such as closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras. | The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and | a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after opening of the LYNX Blue Line light rail. | |
| N/C | Christophor | Miles | I am not against the idea of going green, but I do see where the benefits out way the means on N/G | | consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas | | |
| N/G | Christopher Jeff | Miller | This project is a Loser! | Comment Noted | | | |
| Ms | Esther | Miller | STOP IT !!! This project is a Loser! STOP IT !!! | Comment Noted | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|---------------|-------------|---------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | gerry & adele | mittelstadt | We are living in a 55 and | Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the | | | |
| , - | , | | older community across | evaluation of ROMF alternatives and | | | |
| | | | | explains why the NEPA Preferred | | | |
| | | | | Alternative was selected and why | | | |
| | | | we are against this | the other alternatives were | | | |
| | | | construction being built | eliminated from consideration. The | | | |
| | | | and totally against the | Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is | | | |
| | | | light rail train. | included in the NEPA Preferred | | | |
| | | | | Alternative. | | | |
| | | | | In summary, the Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative site is the most | | | |
| | | | | desirable from a construction and | | | |
| | | | | operations standpoint. It is a 25- | | | |
| | | | | acre site, the largest site of the | | | |
| | | | | alternatives considered. The | | | |
| | | | | Farrington Road ROMF site is | | | |
| | | | | located on a long straight section of | | | |
| | | | | track which accommodates cross- | | | |
| | | | | overs for access to the yard. The site | | | |
| | | | | is reasonably flat, making | | | |
| | | | | preparation of the site for | | | |
| | | | | construction easier. Effective | | | |
| | | | | screening buffers can be provided | | | |
| | | | | around the site. The largest land | | | |
| | | | | owner on the site has expressed | | | |
| | | | | support for the Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative. The site would | | | |
| | | | | have no effects to historic | | | |
| | | | | resources. The Farrington Road | | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative also has the | | | |
| | | | | lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|---|---|------------|------------|
| Mrs | Mary | Moeller | Too close to my children's school and my neighborhood which is going to cause significant increase in traffic as well as strande people meandering in close proximity to over 900 elementary children!! | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection | Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the evaluation of ROMF alternatives and explains why the NEPA Preferred Alternative was selected and why the other alternatives were eliminated from consideration. The Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is included in the NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the yard. The site is reasonably flat, making preparation of the site for construction easier. Effective screening buffers can be provided around the site. The largest land owner on the site has expressed support for the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative. The site would have no effects to historic resources. | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | The Farrington Road ROMF | | |
| | Andrew | Moeller | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Jason | Moon | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Tara | Moon | N/G | | | | |
| | Reginald | Moore | N/G | | | | |
| | Debbie | Moore | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Sandra | Morgan | N/G | | | | |
| | William | Morley | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Lauren | Morris | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Craig | Morris | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 1 - | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Betty | Morris | - | Planning for high-capacity transit in | | | |
| | | | | the Triangle region began more | | | |
| | | | | than 20 years ago, and a number of | | | |
| | | | is needed for Raleigh | studies have been conducted to | | | |
| | | | | advance major transit investments | | | |
| | | | I 40 is packed, not just the | in the area, including extensive | | | |
| | | | universities! | coordination with stakeholders and | | | |
| | | | Also, look at the fiasco of | members of the public to develop, | | | |
| | | | Charlotte rail system! | evaluate, and refine the range of | | | |
| | | | It's an embarrassment!!!! | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | | | |
| | | | Do we want the same for | studies, white papers, and reports | | | |
| | | | Furham and Chapel Hill? | that identified the need for high- | | | |
| | | | NO LIGHT RAIL!!! NO | capacity transit in the region and | | | |
| | | | REZONING!!! | defined the D-O Corridor are | | | |
| | | | | summarized in Section 2.1. These | | | |
| | | | | past studies indicate that the | | | |
| | | | | estimated demand for a | | | |
| | | | | continuously connected rail line to | | | |
| | | | | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | | | |
| | | | | cost effective for the Project. | | | |
| | | | | RTP has a significant number of | | | |
| | | | | jobs, but they are widely distributed | | | |
| | | | | and dispersed compared to Chapel | | | |
| | | | | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | | | |
| | | | | development pattern is not as | | | |
| | | | | conducive to rail. | | | |
| | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | | | |
| | | | | currently evaluating future potential | | | |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be | | | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is | | | |
| | | | | secured for transit in Wake County. | | | |
| N/G | Ronnie | Morrison | N/G | seed of transit in trans county. | | | |
| N/G | Bonnie | IVIOTTISOTI | ט/או | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Ellen | Moul | very expensive project | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and | | | |
| , - | | | with minimal value to | further explained in DEIS chapter 1, | | | |
| | | | | the investment benefits of a project | | | |
| | | | spent more effectively | like the D-O LRT include: improved | | | |
| | | | without disrupting our | mobility, increased connectivity | | | |
| | | | lovely neighborhoods. | through expanded transit options, | | | |
| | | | levely heighteen dead. | and support of future development | | | |
| | | | | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | | |
| | | | | provide a competitive, reliable | | | |
| | | | | alternative to automobile use that | | | |
| | | | | supports compact development. | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Enhanced mobility will also increase | | | |
| | | | | transit operating efficiency: offer a | | | |
| | | | | competitive, reliable transportation | | | |
| | | | | solution that will reduce travel time. | | | |
| | | | | Increased connectivity will expand | | | |
| | | | | transit options between Durham | | | |
| | | | | and Chapel Hill by enhancing and | | | |
| | | | | seamlessly connecting with the | | | |
| | | | | existing transit system. | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | In addition, increased connectivity | | | |
| | | | | will serve major activity and | | | |
| | | | | employment centers between | | | |
| | | | | Durham and Chapel Hill: the | | | |
| | | | | University of North Carolina at | | | |
| | | | | Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, | | | |
| | | | | US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West | | | |
| | | | | Campus, Duke and Durham | | | |
| | | | | Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical | | | |
| N/G | Nell | Mowry | N/G | , , | | | |
| | Felicisimo | Munda | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Ms | felicia | mundy | While I favor light rail in | In general, the project is not | As described in DEIS section 8.1 | | |
| | | ,, | general, I don't believe | expected to have a significant effect | | | |
| | | | this project and its | on traffic on those roadways where | chapter 1, the investment | | |
| | | | current route will | it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor | benefits of a project like the D-O | | |
| | | | | always offer a faster travel time. | LRT include: improved mobility, | | |
| | | | I think this is a huge | However, the D-O LRT Project will | increased connectivity through | | |
| | | | waste of tax payer | provide a competitive and reliable | expanded transit options, and | | |
| | | | money. | travel alternative to the congestion | support of future development | | |
| | | | ' | on these roadways, particularly | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | |
| | | | | during the peak traffic hours and | provide a competitive, reliable | | |
| | | | | will provide improved travel time | alternative to automobile use | | |
| | | | | reliability compared to bus transit | that supports compact | | |
| | | | | services. | development. | | |
| | | | | | · | | |
| | | | | | Enhanced mobility will also | | |
| | | | | | increase transit operating | | |
| | | | | | efficiency: offer a competitive, | | |
| | | | | | reliable transportation solution | | |
| | | | | | that will reduce travel time. | | |
| | | | | | Increased connectivity will | | |
| | | | | | expand transit options between | | |
| | | | | | Durham and Chapel Hill by | | |
| | | | | | enhancing and seamlessly | | |
| | | | | | connecting with the existing | | |
| | | | | | transit system. | | |
| | | | | | • | | |
| | | | | | In addition, increased | | |
| | | | | | connectivity will serve major | | |
| | | | | | activity and employment centers | | |
| | | | | | between Durham and Chapel Hill: | | |
| | | | | | the University of North Carolina | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Dr | William | mundy | problems. | In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services. | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|---|------------|------------|
| | felicia | mundy | This is not a good use of taxpayer money and the existing plan will not solve our current traffic issues. | In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services. | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly | Response 3 | Response 4 |
| | | | | | connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina | | |
| N/G | Joyce | munkacsi | N/G | | | | |
| | James | Munkacsi | N/G | | | | |
| | Beth | Myers | N/G | | | | |
| Mrs. | Darlene | Naugle | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Dennis | Naugle | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|------------|-------------------|---------------------|---|---------------|---|------------|------------|
| Ms. | Dao | Ngo | Train takes longer where | | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment benefits of a project like the D-O LRT include: improved mobility, increased connectivity through expanded transit options, and support of future development plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina | | |
| Mrs | Chi | Nguyen | N/G | | | | |
| N/G Mr. | Michael Pobort | Nguyen Nickerson | N/G | Commont Noted | | | |
| IIVIF. | Robert | Nickerson | This is a boondoggle of major proportion. If completed everyone 30 years from now will look back and say "WHAT WERE THEY THINKING." | Comment Noted | | | |
| Mrs | Hadley | Nixon | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| /0 | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Candace | Noel | · · | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or | | DEIS section 4.10.4 and table | |
| | | | at-grade crossings, home | eliminate pedestrian and motorist | , , , , , | 4.10-6 provides a summary of the | |
| | | | values negatively | conflicts with transit vehicles. | by the year 2035. For more | noise and vibration impacts for | |
| | | | affected, horribly | Detailed information regarding the | information about ridership | the alternatives. For the | |
| | | | expensive given the | roadways, sidewalks, and trails | please see DEIS Section 3.1: | proposed D-O LRT Project, it is | |
| | | | limited businesses that | expected to be affected by the | Public Transportation and DEIS | anticipated that severe noise | |
| | | | can be accessed along the | proposed D-O LRT Project is | Appendix K2: Travel Demand | impacts would occur at one | |
| | | | route. | provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS | Methodology and Results Report. | location and moderate noise | |
| | | | | section 3.6, and the Basis for | As noted in the Executive | impacts would occur at four | |
| | | | | Engineering Design (appendix L). | Summary (ES-5), the region's | locations with the NEPA | |
| | | | | To avoid the potential for incidents | existing transit network is | Preferred Alternative. Vibration | |
| | | | | at -grade intersections, crossings | currently operating at close to | impacts would occur at 8 | |
| | | | | would be signalized or equipped | maximum capacity including 84 | receptors and ground-borne | |
| | | | | with gates with bells to warn of | buses per hour servicing UNC | noise impacts would occur at 13 | |
| | | | | oncoming trains. The trains will also | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | receptors with the NEPA | |
| | | | | have bells and horns. Bells, gates, | servicing Duke University and | Preferred Alternative. Other | |
| | | | | and horns would be activated | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | alternative alignments would | |
| | | | | according to Triangle Transit | Medical Centers. As further | result in some additional impacts | |
| | | | | operating procedures and safety | detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose | at receptors, but the number of | |
| | | | | guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, | and Need, this combination of | additional impact locations is not | |
| | | | | and where applicable, FRA safety | bus routes that currently serve | substantial. None of the ROMF | |
| | | | | guidelines. | the D-O Corridor and provide a | sites would result in noise or | |
| | | | | | high level of transit service | vibration impacts. | |
| | | | | | (Figure 1.5-2). However, there | · | |
| | | | | | are portions of the corridor | Figures 4.10-6 through 4.10-9 | |
| | | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | illustrate the locations of | |
| | | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | receptors that would be | |
| | | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | service, as discussed further in | Additional detail on the impacted | |
| | | | | | DEIS section 3.2. | receptors is provided in appendix | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|---------------------|---|--|------------|------------|------------|
| | | Last Name Norris | I would like to see much more investigation into the possibilities of BRT for this corridor! | Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | | Response 3 | Response 4 |
| Mr. | Blaise | Noto | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Mr. | Blaise | Noto | The costs of this project | The Triangle region has experienced | As stated in DEIS section 7.1, | | |
| | | | are astronomical and will | extraordinary growth in recent | when the proposed D-O LRT | | |
| | | | only escalate over time | years. Growth forecasts show | Project is fully advanced through | | |
| | | | with the costs I once | population in the region increasing | the New Starts process, it is | | |
| | | | again be assumed by the | by 80 percent between 2010 and | anticipated that the New Starts | | |
| | | | taxpayers. Focus on | 2040, from 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within | program will provide | | |
| | | | making the roads better, | the D-O Corridor, the population is | approximately 50 percent of the | | |
| | | | wider, and more and | projected to double and the highest | D-O LRT Project's capital cost. | | |
| | | | better bus transportation. | expected travel intensity (number of | The non-New Starts costs will be | | |
| | | | | trips per acre) in the Triangle region | covered by a combination of | | |
| | | | | is predominately located in this | funding sources, including sales | | |
| | | | | corridor. | tax revenue generated in | | |
| | | | | | Durham and Orange counties, | | |
| | | | | Even under current demands, the | funding from North Carolina | | |
| | | | | region's transportation system is | Department of Transportation | | |
| | | | | beginning to strain. Levels of | (NCDOT), and other local fees | | |
| | | | | congestion are increasing and are | and taxes. Triangle Transit will | | |
| | | | | anticipated to worsen, which will | also pursue Transportation | | |
| | | | | lead to increased travel times and | Infrastructure Finance and | | |
| | | | | the continuation of automobile- | Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit | | |
| | | | | oriented development patterns. The | assistance and possible | | |
| | | | | region's explosive growth is also | alternative financing and value | | |
| | | | | outpacing the ability to repair, | capture options. | | |
| | | | | replace and expand the existing | | | |
| | | | | roadway network. Considering | | | |
| | | | | financial and environmental issues, | | | |
| | | | | simply increasing highway capacity | | | |
| | | | | to meet these demands is no longer | | | |
| | | | | a viable option (ES-5). | | | |
| | | | | ' ' ' | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Robert | O'Connell | Why hurt so many to try | Various transit technologies were | GoTriangle forecasts an average | | |
| , - | | | to advantage so few? | previously studied and evaluated in | of 23,000 weekday light rail trips | | |
| | | | | an extensive public process called | by the year 2035. For more | | |
| | | | · · | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | information about ridership | | |
| | | | many both on and not | Technologies considered during the | please see DEIS Section 3.1: | | |
| | | | one the trains. Let's do | AA included: conventional bus, Bus | Public Transportation and DEIS | | |
| | | | the array of: buses, bus | Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light | Appendix K2: Travel Demand | | |
| | | | lanes, staggered work | Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter | Methodology and Results Report. | | |
| | | | hours, car pools, bike | Rail Transit (CRT). Through the | As noted in the Executive | | |
| | | | · · | Alternatives Analysis, light rail was | Summary (ES-5), the region's | | |
| | | | | selected as the best transit | existing transit network is | | |
| | | | more and more. Thanks | technology option to best serve the | currently operating at close to | | |
| | | | for listening. | Durham-Orange Corridor and to | maximum capacity including 84 | | |
| | | | Think deeply and wisely! | meet the Purpose and Need of the | buses per hour servicing UNC | | |
| | | | | proposed transit project. The | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | |
| | | | | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | servicing Duke University and | | |
| | | | | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | |
| | | | | The Alternatives Analysis is available | | | |
| | | | | on ourtransitfuture.com. | detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose | | |
| | | | | | and Need, this combination of | | |
| | | | | | bus routes that currently serve | | |
| | | | | | the D-O Corridor and provide a | | |
| | | | | | high level of transit service | | |
| | | | | | (Figure 1.5-2). However, there | | |
| | | | | | are portions of the corridor | | |
| | | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | |
| | | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | |
| | | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | |
| | | | | | additional buses will not improve | | |
| | | | | | service, as discussed further in | | |
| | | | | | DEIS section 3.2. | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Peggy | O'Connell | Why hurt so many to try | Various transit technologies were | GoTriangle forecasts an average | | |
| | | | to advantage so few? | previously studied and evaluated in | of 23,000 weekday light rail trips | | |
| | | | Why not do the "non-hurt | an extensive public process called | by the year 2035. For more | | |
| | | | any" for the benefit of the | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | information about ridership | | |
| | | | many both on and not | Technologies considered during the | please see DEIS Section 3.1: | | |
| | | | one the trains. Let's do | AA included: conventional bus, Bus | Public Transportation and DEIS | | |
| | | | the array of: buses, bus | Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light | Appendix K2: Travel Demand | | |
| | | | lanes, staggered work | Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter | Methodology and Results Report. | | |
| | | | hours, car pools, bike | Rail Transit (CRT). Through the | As noted in the Executive | | |
| | | | lanes, coordinated street | Alternatives Analysis, light rail was | Summary (ES-5), the region's | | |
| | | | lights, smart streets and | selected as the best transit | existing transit network is | | |
| | | | more and more. Thanks | technology option to best serve the | currently operating at close to | | |
| | | | for listening. | Durham-Orange Corridor and to | maximum capacity including 84 | | |
| | | | Think deeply and wisely! | meet the Purpose and Need of the | buses per hour servicing UNC | | |
| | | | | proposed transit project. The | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | |
| | | | | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | servicing Duke University and | | |
| | | | | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | |
| | | | | The Alternatives Analysis is available | Medical Centers. As further | | |
| | | | | on ourtransitfuture.com. | detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose | | |
| | | | | | and Need, this combination of | | |
| | | | | | bus routes that currently serve | | |
| | | | | | the D-O Corridor and provide a | | |
| | | | | | high level of transit service | | |
| | | | | | (Figure 1.5-2). However, there | | |
| | | | | | are portions of the corridor | | |
| | | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | |
| | | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | |
| | | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | |
| | | | | | additional buses will not improve | | |
| | | | | | service, as discussed further in | | |
| | | | | | DEIS section 3.2. | | |
| Ms. | Maureen | Oakes | N/G | | | | |
| | Ilana | Osten | N/G | | | | |
| Mr. | William | Ott | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|
| Mrs | Marissa | Outten | project needs to be stopped. | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines. | https://connect.ncdot.gov/resou rces/safety/pages/crash- data.aspx. | | |
| N/G | karen | paden | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Susan | Palmer | N/G | | | | |
| Mr. | John | Parker | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Patrick | Parks | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Kristi | Passaro | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Paul | Passaro | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| N/G | Virginia | Pate | I am particularly | Planning for high-capacity transit in | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | In general, the project is not |
| | | | concerned about the | the Triangle region began more | or eliminate pedestrian and | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | expected to have a significant |
| | | | safety of multiple grade | than 20 years ago, and a number of | motorist conflicts with transit | Project on the existing roadway | effect on traffic on those |
| | | | level crossings around my | studies have been conducted to | vehicles. | network and any measures | roadways where it is close to D-O |
| | | | neighborhood but also | advance major transit investments | Detailed information regarding | recommended to mitigate such | LRT Project, nor always offer a |
| | | | question who will actually | in the area, including extensive | the roadways, sidewalks, and | impacts. Technical reports that | faster travel time. However, the D- |
| | | | benefit from this project. | coordination with stakeholders and | trails expected to be affected by | report the results of traffic | O LRT Project will provide a |
| | | | Traffic between South | members of the public to develop, | the proposed D-O LRT Project is | simulations are included as | competitive and reliable travel |
| | | | Durham & UNC along | evaluate, and refine the range of | provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | alternative to the congestion on |
| | | | Barbee Chapel Rd seems | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | section 3.6, and the Basis for | DEIS. | these roadways, particularly |
| | | | to be one of the more | studies, white papers, and reports | Engineering Design (appendix L). | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | during the peak traffic hours and |
| | | | highly traveled routes in | that identified the need for high- | To avoid the potential for | proposed mitigation measures | will provide improved travel time |
| | | | this area, perhaps second | capacity transit in the region and | incidents at -grade intersections, | that are planned to mitigate for | reliability compared to bus transit |
| | | | only to US-54 to I-40 from | defined the D-O Corridor are | crossings would be signalized or | project-related roadway effects. | services. |
| | | | UNC to RTP; the light rail | summarized in Section 2.1. These | equipped with gates with bells to | These effects are summarized in | |
| | | | will not serve either of | past studies indicate that the | warn of oncoming trains. The | Table 3.2-3. In addition, as | |
| | | | those communities and | estimated demand for a | trains will also have bells and | described in DEIS section 3.2.2, | |
| | | | will actually cause | continuously connected rail line to | horns. Bells, gates, and horns | there are numerous roadway | |
| | | | increased traffic delays | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | would be activated according to | project planned by the NCDOT in | |
| | | | due to street level | cost effective for the Project. | Triangle Transit operating | the vicinity of the proposed D-O | |
| | | | crossing on the south side | RTP has a significant number of | procedures and safety guidelines, | LRT Project. During Engineering, | |
| | | | of 54. | jobs, but they are widely distributed | NCDOT safety guidelines, and | Triangle Transit will continue to | |
| | | | | and dispersed compared to Chapel | where applicable, FRA safety | coordinate with the NCDOT as | |
| | | | | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | guidelines. | the designs of these projects | |
| | | | | development pattern is not as | | advance. | |
| | | | | conducive to rail. | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | |
| | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | |
| | | | | currently evaluating future potential | | substantial modifications to the | |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be | | roadway are incorporated into | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is | | the design including additional | |
| | | | | secured for transit in Wake County. | | turn bays and restriping of | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Dr | Scottie | Pate | My objection is to ground | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | The design of the alignment with | | |
| | Scottle | rate | level tracks in an already | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | regards to at-grade crossings, | | |
| | | | congested high-traffic | Project on the existing roadway | grade-separated crossings, or | | |
| | | | area | network and any measures | closures/elimination of crossings | | |
| | | | alea | recommended to mitigate such | is primarily based on an | | |
| | | | | | assessment of the topography to | | |
| | | | | impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic | be traversed by the alignment as | | |
| | | | | simulations are included as | | | |
| | | | | | well as the projected traffic on | | |
| | | | | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | the roadway that is crossed. To | | |
| | | | | DEIS. | maintain the cost effectiveness | | |
| | | | | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | of the LRT project in order to | | |
| | | | | proposed mitigation measures that | qualify for federal funding, the | | |
| | | | | are planned to mitigate for project- | alignment will be at-grade unless | | |
| | | | | related roadway effects. These | either of these two criteria | | |
| | | | | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | requires grade-separation. | | |
| | | | | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | | | |
| | | | | roadway project planned by the | | | |
| | | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | | | |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | | | |
| | | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | | | |
| | | | | continue to coordinate with the | | | |
| | | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | | | |
| | | | | projects advance. | | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | | | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | | | |
| N/G | Frances | Patterson | N/G | | | | |
| | Hal | Patterson | N/G | | | | |
| mr | louis | payne | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|
| | | Pearl | This money would be better served to be used | Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | | Response 3 | Response 4 |
| Ms | Barbara | Pelet | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| NAr | Sandy | Pendergraft | Llive near the intersection | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | | | |
| IVII | Saliuy | rendergrant | | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | | | |
| | | | HWY54. The traffic is | Project on the existing roadway | | | |
| | | | already very bad during | network and any measures | | | |
| | | | the rush hours. | recommended to mitigate such | | | |
| | | | Sometimes it takes a | impacts. Technical reports that | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | while to just get out of | report the results of traffic | | | |
| | | | my driveway. This rail | simulations are included as | | | |
| | | | system would make it | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | | | |
| | | | unbearable. | DEIS. | | | |
| | | | | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | | | |
| | | | | proposed mitigation measures that | | | |
| | | | | are planned to mitigate for project- | | | |
| | | | | related roadway effects. These | | | |
| | | | | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | | | |
| | | | | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | | | |
| | | | | roadway project planned by the | | | |
| | | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | | | |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | | | |
| | | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | | | |
| | | | | continue to coordinate with the | | | |
| | | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | | | |
| | | | | projects advance. | | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | | | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | | | |
| | Steve | Pendergraft | N/G | | | | |
| | LeeAnne | Pendergraft | N/G | | | | |
| | LuAnne | Pendergraft | N/G | | | | |
| | Don | Pendergraft | N/G | | | | |
| Mr. | Roger | Pendleton | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Mr | Lawrence | Perkins | I oppose the light rail | Planning for high-capacity transit in | | | |
| | | | project. It is expensive | the Triangle region began more | | | |
| | | | and since it won't go to | than 20 years ago, and a number of | | | |
| | | | the airport or the RTP, it | studies have been conducted to | | | |
| | | | won't be used. | advance major transit investments | | | |
| | | | | in the area, including extensive | | | |
| | | | | coordination with stakeholders and | | | |
| | | | | members of the public to develop, | | | |
| | | | | evaluate, and refine the range of | | | |
| | | | | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | | | |
| | | | | studies, white papers, and reports | | | |
| | | | | that identified the need for high- | | | |
| | | | | capacity transit in the region and | | | |
| | | | | defined the D-O Corridor are | | | |
| | | | | summarized in Section 2.1. These | | | |
| | | | | past studies indicate that the | | | |
| | | | | estimated demand for a | | | |
| | | | | continuously connected rail line to | | | |
| | | | | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | | | |
| | | | | cost effective for the Project. | | | |
| | | | | RTP has a significant number of | | | |
| | | | | jobs, but they are widely distributed | | | |
| | | | | and dispersed compared to Chapel | | | |
| | | | | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | | | |
| | | | | development pattern is not as | | | |
| | | | | conducive to rail. | | | |
| | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | | | |
| | | | | currently evaluating future potential | | | |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be | | | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is | | | |
| | | | | secured for transit in Wake County. | | | |
| N/G | mary | Pettiette | N/G | | | | |
| | Mitch | Phillips | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|------------|
| Mrs | Christine | Phillips | Putting an industrial | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents | Many communities across the | |
| | | I | | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | the evaluation of ROMF | country are implementing or | |
| | | | · · | Project on the existing roadway | alternatives and explains why the | , | |
| | | | near an elementary | network and any measures | · · · · · | systems because of the long term | |
| | | | school and where it will | recommended to mitigate such | selected and why the other | value and opportunities which | |
| | | | drive out local wildlife is | impacts. Technical reports that | alternatives were eliminated | they bring to businesses, home | |
| | | | not acceptable. There are | report the results of traffic | from consideration. The | owners, and people of all | |
| | | | several more reasons why | simulations are included as | Farrington Road ROMF | generations living, working, | |
| | | | this is not a good idea: | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | Alternative is included in the | learning, and traveling along light | |
| | | | traffic issues, value of real | DEIS. | NEPA Preferred Alternative. | rail corridors. Studies of light rail | |
| | | | estate and increases in | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | In summary, the Farrington Road | projects around the country have | |
| | | | the taxes around this area | proposed mitigation measures that | ROMF Alternative site is the most | shown a positive impact on | |
| | | | to pay for the outrageous | are planned to mitigate for project- | desirable from a construction | properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of | |
| | | | cost of building this. I am | related roadway effects. These | and operations standpoint. It is a | a station, cloeset to the improved | |
| | | | against this and it is not | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | 25-acre site, the largest site of | transportation service. | |
| | | | necessary between | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | the alternatives considered. The | Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 | |
| | | | Durham and chapel hill. | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | Farrington Road ROMF site is | studies around the country, | |
| | | | | roadway project planned by the | located on a long straight section | residential property value | |
| | | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | of track which accommodates | premiums of 3%-40% were | |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | cross-overs for access to the | observed in rail station areas. In | |
| | | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | yard. The site is reasonably flat, | Charlotte, a study of single-family | |
| | | | | continue to coordinate with the | making preparation of the site | home prices indicated increased | |
| | | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | for construction easier. Effective | value of properties close to light | |
| | | | | projects advance. | screening buffers can be | rail stations relative to properties | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | provided around the site. The | farther from stations after | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | largest land owner on the site | opening of the LYNX Blue Line | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | has expressed support for the | light rail. | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | Farrington Road ROMF | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | Alternative. The site would have | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | no effects to historic resources. | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | The Farrington Road ROMF | | |
| Mr. | Dustan | Phillips | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | susan | pierce | Maintenance facility at | The proposed D-O LRT Project | | | |
| , - | | , | Farrington is a hazard | would include a ROMF where light | | | |
| | | | both to the elementary | rail vehicles would be stored and | | | |
| | | | school and an over 55 | maintained. This facility would have | | | |
| | | | community. Toxic fumes | the indirect effect of generating | | | |
| | | | are a special hazard for | regulated materials associated | | | |
| | | | the young and the | because of maintenance activities. | | | |
| | | | elderly. D3 | These materials would include oils, | | | |
| | | | | greases, solvents, and other waste | | | |
| | | | | materials. | | | |
| | | | | While the light rail vehicles, as | | | |
| | | | | noted in DEIS section 4.8.3.1, do not | | | |
| | | | | operate on gasoline or oils that | | | |
| | | | | could spill and contaminate the | | | |
| | | | | groundwater through the operation | | | |
| | | | | of the light rail, as noted above, | | | |
| | | | | regulated materials would be | | | |
| | | | | generated from maintenance | | | |
| | | | | activities at the ROMF. As such, all | | | |
| | | | | regulated materials, including fluids | | | |
| | | | | (e.g., oils, greases, solvents and | | | |
| | | | | other waste materials), used at the | | | |
| | | | | ROMF will be captured and stored in | | | |
| | | | | tanks, where they will be | | | |
| | | | | periodically collected by an outside | | | |
| | | | | vendor for off-site recycling or | | | |
| | | | | disposal. All regulated materials will | | | |
| | | | | be disposed of in accordance with | | | |
| | | | | state and local guidelines and no | | | |
| | | | | substantial indirect impacts are | | | |
| | | | | anticipated. | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Dr. | Susan | Pierce | _ | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce or | ' ' | As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 | |
| | | | NOT safe. | eliminate pedestrian and motorist | would include a ROMF where | and 8.2.2.1, construction of the | |
| | | | Farrington RAMF next to | conflicts with transit vehicles. | light rail vehicles would be stored | ROMF at the Farrington Road site | |
| | | | an elementary school and | Detailed information regarding the | and maintained. This facility | will require land use entitlements | |
| | | | a community for elders is | roadways, sidewalks, and trails | would have the indirect effect of | including a comprehensive plan | |
| | | | NOT safe pending the | expected to be affected by the | generating regulated materials | amendment and rezoning. | |
| | | | need to evacuate due to | proposed D-O LRT Project is | associated because of | It is expected that the City and/or | |
| | | | "accidents" from | provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS | maintenance activities. These | County of Durham will place | |
| | | | flammable liquids that | section 3.6, and the Basis for | materials would include oils, | conditions on the approvals that | |
| | | | will be used daily, 24 | Engineering Design (appendix L). | greases, solvents, and other | appropriate mitigation measures | |
| | | | hours, 7 days/week | To avoid the potential for incidents | waste materials. | are included in the design, | |
| | | | not to mention that this | at -grade intersections, crossings | While the light rail vehicles, as | including strategies to | |
| | | | area is zoned R-20, | would be signalized or equipped | noted in DEIS section 4.8.3.1, do | complement the surrounding | |
| | | | residential. | with gates with bells to warn of | not operate on gasoline or oils | context such as use of | |
| | | | | oncoming trains. The trains will also | that could spill and contaminate | architectural styles and/or | |
| | | | | have bells and horns. Bells, gates, | the groundwater through the | landscape design. | |
| | | | | and horns would be activated | operation of the light rail, as | During Engineering, Triangle | |
| | | | | according to Triangle Transit | noted above, regulated materials | Transit will continue to | |
| | | | | operating procedures and safety | would be generated from | coordinate with property owners | |
| | | | | guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, | maintenance activities at the | and residents near the site to | |
| | | | | and where applicable, FRA safety | ROMF. As such, all regulated | develop and refine these | |
| | | | | guidelines. | materials, including fluids (e.g., | strategies. The public will also | |
| | | | | | oils, greases, solvents and other | have the opportunity to | |
| | | | | | waste materials), used at the | comment on the design through | |
| | | | | | ROMF will be captured and | a public hearing as part of the | |
| | | | | | stored in tanks, where they will | City and/or County approval | |
| | | | | | be periodically collected by an | process. | |
| | | | | | outside vendor for off-site | As described in DEIS section | |
| | | | | | recycling or disposal. All | 4.10.4, no noise impacts are | |
| | | | | | regulated materials will be | anticipated at the Farrington | |
| | | | | | disposed of in accordance with | ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|
| mr | William | Pitts | There is not sufficient | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | As stated in Triangle Transit's | Land use broadly refers to the | |
| | | | density to support light | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | Request to Enter the New Starts | different functions of human use | |
| | | | rail in this area at this | the year 2035. For more | Program Project Development | of land (e.g., residential, | |
| | | | time. Building a light rail | information about ridership please | Phase for the proposed Durham- | commercial, industrial) and is | |
| | | | system to encourage | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | Orange Light Rail Transit Project: | influenced by development | |
| | | | density is totally | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | | patterns and activity centers, | |
| | | | backwards. | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | "Within the D-O Corridor, transit | population and employment | |
| | | | | and Results Report. As noted in the | use already rivals larger | levels, growth potential and | |
| | | | | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | municipalities. For example, | trends, local and regional land | |
| | | | | region's existing transit network is | when Chapel Hill Transit, Durham | use policies, and other factors | |
| | | | | currently operating at close to | Area Transit Authority, Duke | that affect area growth. | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | University Transit, and Triangle | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | Transit riders are counted | DEIS section 4.1 describes land | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | together, approximately 70,000 | use and land use policy in the D- | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | transit trips occur every weekday | O Corridor and the potential | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | within and between Chapel Hill | impacts of the alternatives under | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | and Durham. This level of | study in the DEIS. Population and | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | ridership is comparable to the | employment data related to land | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | roughly 73,000 daily transit trips | uses are presented in DEIS | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | taken in Charlotte in 2006, the | section 4.2. | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | year before the LYNX Blue Line | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | Light Rail Transit Line opened." | Transit-supportive growth and | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | | development is expected to | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | Since Charlotte opened the Blue | continue throughout the corridor | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | Line in 2007, Charlotte has | due largely to positive market | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | continued to expand its rail | forces, supportive land use | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | transit system. In 2015 it opened | policies, and capacity for growth | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | the Gold Line (streetcar) and is | and supportive public | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | investments. Market support for | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | _ | this type of development | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | (LRT). | includes shifting lifestyle | |
| Mrs | Amanda | Podgoreanu | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Joel | Poe | N/G | | | | |
| | Patricia | Porter | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Barbara | Post | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|--|------------|------------|------------|
| | Philp | Post | We need and can afford Bus Rapid Transit, which has the power to serve a much wider area of Orange and Durham Counties. We do Not need a fixed rail system and we cannot afford it and it will not be flexible enough to serve our citizens. | Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | Nesponse 2 | Nesponse 3 | Response 4 |
| MS | Teresa | Priboth | N/G | _ | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Joe | Procopio | Light rail is not feasible | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | | | |
| | | | for a metro area as widely | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | | | |
| | | | spread as ours. This is a | the year 2035. For more | | | |
| | | | train to nowhere. | information about ridership please | | | |
| | | | | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | | | |
| | | | | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | | | |
| | | | | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | | | |
| | | | | and Results Report. As noted in the | | | |
| | | | | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | | | |
| | | | | region's existing transit network is | | | |
| | | | | currently operating at close to | | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|--|---|---|------------|------------|
| Mrs. | Allison | Procopio | Please do not spoil our quiet family communities when alternatives like 15-501 would be less intrusive and be accessible to so many more people. Plus, traffic on Farrington is already terrible in the morning and rush hour. | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate | Various alternative alignments were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Alternatives considered during the AA included routes along US 15-501. Through the Alternatives Analysis, the alignment that follows NC 54, George King Road, and Farrington Road was selected as the best alternative to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | | |
| Mr. and M | Mark | Prokop | Stop Durham-Orange Light Rail Train | Comment Noted | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Prof. | John | Pucher | The planned LRT from | Various transit technologies were | | | |
| | | | Chapel Hill to Durham | previously studied and evaluated in | | | |
| | | | should be cancelled, as it | an extensive public process called | | | |
| | | | would be a tragic waste of | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | | | |
| | | | scarce tax dollars needed | Technologies considered during the | | | |
| | | | to fund improvements in | AA included: conventional bus, BRT, | | | |
| | | | bus services, including | Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), | | | |
| | | | express service and Bus | and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). | | | |
| | | | Rapid Transit throughout | Through the Alternatives Analysis, | | | |
| | | | the Triangle Area. All | light rail was selected as the best | | | |
| | | | studies show that express | transit technology option to best | | | |
| | | | bus service and BRT are | serve the Durham-Orange Corridor | | | |
| | | | much more effective than | and to meet the Purpose and Need | | | |
| | | | LRT, which is an outdated | of the proposed transit project. The | | | |
| | | | technology. It would take | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | | | |
| | | | 15 years to complete the | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | | | |
| | | | D-O LRT, while improved | The Alternatives Analysis is available | | | |
| | | | bus service could start | on ourtransitfuture.com. | | | |
| | | | within a year or two. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Mrs | Pamela | Pulsfort | I helieve that the light rail | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | | | |
| 14113 | unicia | i distort | | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | | | |
| | | | | Project on the existing roadway | | | |
| | | | | network and any measures | | | |
| | | | will be enough people | recommended to mitigate such | | | |
| | | | riding it to off set the | impacts. Technical reports that | | | |
| | | | | report the results of traffic | | | |
| | | | will be very disruptive to | simulations are included as | | | |
| | | | traffic at the Downing | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | | | |
| | | | Creek entrance and along | | | | |
| | | | - | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | | | |
| | | | the already huge traffic | proposed mitigation measures that | | | |
| | | | tie ups during UNC | are planned to mitigate for project- | | | |
| | | | events. It will be a huge | related roadway effects. These | | | |
| | | | disaster that we have to | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | | | |
| | | | pay for with taxpayer | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | | | |
| | | | funds and traffic | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | | | |
| | | | congestion. Also, the | roadway project planned by the | | | |
| | | | state wants to widen Hwy | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | | | |
| | | | 54 after light rail is in | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | | | |
| | | | place. That will be a | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | | | |
| | | | double disaster. Build it | continue to coordinate with the | | | |
| | | | then move it??? Who is | NCDOT as the designs of these | | | |
| | | | making these decisions? | projects advance. | | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | | | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| | - | | | | | | |
| N/G | J. | Pulsfort | | | As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, | | |
| | | | least 26 years of mass | extraordinary growth in recent | over the past 10 years, Triangle | | |
| | | | · ' | years. Growth forecasts show | Transit increased bus ridership by | | |
| | | | • | population in the region increasing | more than 140 percent adding | | |
| | | | | by 80 percent between 2010 and | more than a million additional | | |
| | | | numerous federally & | 2040, from 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within | trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure | | |
| | | | state subsidized programs | the D-O Corridor, the population is | 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels | | |
| | | | which to date, by your | projected to double and the highest | of congestion within the D-O | | |
| | | | own figures, have failed | expected travel intensity (number of | Corridor, it is becoming difficult | | |
| | | | to carry more than some | trips per acre) in the Triangle region | to maintain schedule adherence | | |
| | | | 1500 riders, despite | is predominately located in this | and consistency in travel times | | |
| | | | regional growth that | corridor. | for bus routes in the corridor. On- | | |
| | | | exceeds Charlotte's. | | time performance for weekday | | |
| | | | Raleigh already rejected | Even under current demands, the | regional routes operating within | | |
| | | | this faulty plan. Quit | region's transportation system is | the D-O Corridor is equal to or | | |
| | | | trying to foist it upon us. | beginning to strain. Levels of | worse than the overall Triangle | | |
| | | | The federal budget can't | congestion are increasing and are | Transit system average (Table 1.3- | | |
| | | | - | anticipated to worsen, which will | 1 and Figure 1.3-3). | | |
| | | | | lead to increased travel times and | | | |
| | | | terrorist attacks in Spain, | the continuation of automobile- | As noted in the Executive | | |
| | | | | oriented development patterns. The | Summary (ES-5), the region's | | |
| | | | | region's explosive growth is also | existing transit network is | | |
| | | | children and families | outpacing the ability to repair, | currently operating at close to | | |
| | | | anyway. | replace and expand the existing | maximum capacity including 84 | | |
| | | | | roadway network. Considering | buses per hour servicing UNC | | |
| | | | | financial and environmental issues, | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | |
| | | | | simply increasing highway capacity | servicing Duke University and | | |
| | | | _ | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | |
| | | | | a viable option (ES-5). | Medical Centers. As further | | |
| | | | arrive by roads, not | | detailed in DEIS section 1.5.1.2 of | | |
| | | | expensively limited light | | the Purpose and Need, this | | |
| N/G | John | Quinterno | N/G | | | | |
| | JERRY | RAWLINSON | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|---|---|--|------------|
| Mr | | Ray | There is no need to burden the tax payers with a system that will | Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. | Construction of the D-O LRT Project will be funded through a variety of local, state, and federal sources. The local funding will be paid from a portion of the half- cent sales tax dedicated for transit in Durham and Orange counties, \$10 annual vehicle registration fee dedicated for transit, and 5% tax surcharge on car rentals dedicated for transit. Other local funding sources such as value capture strategies may also be pursued. State funding is allocated to the project through the State Transportation Improvement Program. Federal funding is anticipated through the Federal Transit Administration "New Starts" Capital Investment Grant program. | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS | |
| | Ervin | Rea | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Ms | Ann | Recesso | Placing light rail across the entrance to Downing Creek is dangerous and will cause unnecessary traffic congestion. It seems this area cannot support light rail regardless as the population, no matter how lawyers fiddle with the statistics, does not warrant it. | There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During nonpeak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times. | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| N/G | Michael | Reed | The current light rail | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | | | |
| | | | | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | | | |
| | | | not meet the | the year 2035. For more | | | |
| | | | transportation needs of | information about ridership please | | | |
| | | | our community. | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | | | |
| | | | | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | | | |
| | | | | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | | | |
| | | | | and Results Report. As noted in the | | | |
| | | | | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | | | |
| | | | | region's existing transit network is | | | |
| | | | | currently operating at close to | | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | | |
| N/G | Christine | Reed | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|
| Mr | Lucas | Reed | with the greatest ridership needs. I prefer the no build option to the current plan. | GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and | | | |
| N/G | Kelly | Reilly | N/G | | | | |
| | | Reilly | N/G | | | | |
| | Judith | Rhew | N/G | | | | |
| | | Rhodes | N/G | | | | |
| | | Rice | Do NOT build the Light Rail Train!! | Comment Noted | | | |
| Mrs. | Stacey | Richardson | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Becky | Riggsbee | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|---------|-----------------|-----------|--|--|---|------------|------------|
| Mr | John | Riordan | The Durham-Orange Light Rail plans seem quite incomplete and very poorly developed. | Comment Noted | | | |
| N/G | Rita | Robbins | N/G | | | | |
| | Henry | robbins | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Janet | roberson | N/G | | | | |
| Mr. | Roderick | Roberson | N/G | | | | |
| Mrs. | Robyn Weaver | Robyn | as the proponents would like taxpayers to believe. This seems like a waste of my tax dollars especially given the monumental problems on the I-40 corridor between Chapel Hill and Raleigh, which the light rail will do | Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel Hill and Durham. This dispersed development pattern is not as conducive to rail. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County. | of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham | | |
| 1411.3. | 14010 | Notice | 14,5 | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|--|--|--|---|------------|
| | FirstName Mallory | Roman | The costs far outweigh the benefits of the light rail. Most people in the region already have transportation. A much less invasive transportation solution can be offered to those who don't by simply improving the bus system. Building and operating the light rail will disturb hundreds of homeowners and decrease property values for many of us who | | As stated in DEIS section 1.3.2, over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. Ontime performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse than the overall Triangle Transit system average (Table 1.3-1 and Figure 1.3-3). As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's | Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. | |
| | | | | The Alternatives Analysis is available | 1 and Figure 1.3-3). As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|----------------|-------------------|--|--|---|--|------------|
| Ms | Margaret q | Roos-Codsi | figures, With non-flexible routes. BRT would have the ability to flex with the situations as they change in coming years.6bv | an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, BRT, Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | or eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines. | appendix K.1, consistent with appendix K.2. The TRM was developed by the Triangle Regional Model Service Bureau (TRMSB), in cooperation with regional stakeholders Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO), Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO), | |
| | Eugene | Rossitch | N/G | | | | |
| | Steffi | Rubin | N/G | | | | |
| | Charles | Rushbrook | N/G | | | | |
| | Charles | Rushbrook | N/G | | | | |
| | Paula | Russell | N/G | | | | |
| | | Saleeby | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | rhoda | Salter samuels | N/G Too expensive and too visually unappealing. Too dangerous and too inconvenient. | Comment Noted | | | |
| N/G | Ariel and Phil | Sandick | N/G | | | | |

| N/0 | | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-----|-------------|-----------|---------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Donna | sayers | The light rail was to go | The Town of Chapel Hill requested | | | |
| | | • | through Meadowmont | that alternatives to the C1 | | | |
| | | | and as promised, it still | alignments be studied as part of the | | | |
| | | | should. | Alternatives Analysis for the Project. | | | |
| | | | | As a result, the Project team | | | |
| | | | | developed the C2 alignments as part | | | |
| | | | | of the Alternatives Analysis. In | | | |
| | | | | February 2012, the Durham-Chapel | | | |
| | | | | Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning | | | |
| | | | | Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted | | | |
| | | | | the proposed D-O LRT Project, | | | |
| | | | | including both the C1 and C2 | | | |
| | | | | alignment corridors. | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | The Town of Chapel Hill expressed | | | |
| | | | | its preference for an alignment | | | |
| | | | | running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A | | | |
| | | | | Alternatives) that would be more | | | |
| | | | | supportive of planned future | | | |
| | | | | growth than C1 and C1A | | | |
| | | | | Alternatives. These alternatives | | | |
| | | | | would result in a conversion of less | | | |
| | | | | dense land uses into higher density | | | |
| | | | | uses near stations. These impacts | | | |
| | | | | are considered beneficial and | | | |
| | | | | consistent with local planning. | | | |
| | | | | l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l | | | |
| | | | | The C1 Alternative would impact | | | |
| | | | | undisturbed natural areas including | | | |
| | | | | the Little Creek Bottomlands and | | | |
| | | | | Slopes Significant Natural Heritage | | | |
| Mr | Christopher | Scallion | N/G | | | | |
| | | Scallion | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|----------------|----------------|---|---|---|---|------------|
| Dr | Allison | Schmitt | Too much noise for a residential neighborhood and too much environmental impact. Traffic congestion would be unbearable | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate | 4.10.4, no noise impacts are anticipated at the Farrington ROMF. DEIS section 4.10.4 and table 4.10-6 provides a summary of the noise and vibration impacts for the alternatives. For the proposed D-O LRT Project, it is anticipated that severe noise impacts would occur at one location and moderate noise impacts would occur at four locations with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Vibration impacts would occur at 8 receptors and ground-borne noise impacts would occur at 13 receptors with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Other alternative alignments would result in some additional impacts at receptors, but the number of additional impact locations is not substantial. None of the ROMF sites would result in noise or vibration impacts. Figures 4.10-6 through 4.10-9 illustrate the locations of | wildlife impacts. At the crossing of Little Creek, the NEPA Preferred C2A alternative follows along the existing NC 54 for much of its length, minimizing additional habitat fragmentation. The C2A alignment only turns north along George King Road, away from NC 54, in an area of upland forest, and avoids the highest quality bottomland forest habitat of the Little Creek corridor. Similarly, the NEPA Preferred NHC 2 alternative avoids cutting through the intact | |
| Mr | Christopher | Schmitt | We strongly oppose this development. | Comment Noted | impacted by the NETATTERENE | crossings will reducte raised rull | |
| mrs | vicki | scott | This proposal is very damaging to our community and not financially smart with the amount of usage that is expected. | Comment Noted | | | |
| | Lauren Carl | Scott Scott | N/G I oppose this Lite Rail on Patterson Rd | Comment Noted | | | |
| Ms | Nancy | Scott | | Comment Noted | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|---|----------------------------|---|------------|
| N/G | Stephanie | Scotti | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | E. Jane | Seeley | While I, in general, support the light rail concept; there are elements of the proposed | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate | To avoid the potential for | NEPA Preferred Alternative. In summary, the Farrington Road ROMF Alternative site is the most desirable from a construction and operations standpoint. It is a 25-acre site, the largest site of the alternatives considered. The Farrington Road ROMF site is located on a long straight section of track which accommodates cross-overs for access to the | |
| Ms | Anita | Shanker | N/G | | | | |
| | George | Sharpley | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Michael | Shepard | I don't wish to have this rail system. This is a huge impact to me and my lifestyle. | Comment Noted | | | |
| | Rachel | Shepard | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Ruth | Shrieve | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Mrs. | Julia | Simons | I observe most buses in | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | Various transit technologies were | | |
| | | | our area, SW Durham, | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | previously studied and evaluated | | |
| | | | only have a few | the year 2035. For more | in an extensive public process | | |
| | | | passengers! We could | information about ridership please | called the "Alternatives Analysis" | | |
| | | | use smaller buses | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | (AA). Technologies considered | | |
| | | | . I don't see the need | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | during the AA included: | | |
| | | | for light-rail in this area, | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | conventional bus, Bus Rapid | | |
| | | | at all!! | and Results Report. As noted in the | Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail | | |
| | | | | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail | | |
| | | | | region's existing transit network is | Transit (CRT). Through the | | |
| | | | | currently operating at close to | Alternatives Analysis, light rail | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | was selected as the best transit | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | technology option to best serve | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | the Durham-Orange Corridor and | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | to meet the Purpose and Need of | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | the proposed transit project. The | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | findings of the Alternatives | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | of the DEIS. The Alternatives | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | Analysis is available on | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | ourtransitfuture.com. | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|--|---|---|------------|
| | Richard | Sloane | (bikes, buses, and carpools), I believe this project does little if anything to alleviate current congestion, and costs way to much. Get more buses and add a stop in front of Downing Creek - so much cheaper than this project. The widened shoulder on Barbee Chapel has been a great improvement for cyclists! | In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services. | in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | over the past 10 years, Triangle Transit increased bus ridership by more than 140 percent adding more than a million additional trips from 2005 to 2014 (Figure 1.3-2). Due to the growing levels of congestion within the D-O Corridor, it is becoming difficult to maintain schedule adherence and consistency in travel times for bus routes in the corridor. Ontime performance for weekday regional routes operating within the D-O Corridor is equal to or worse than the overall Triangle Transit system average (Table 1.3- | |
| | Teresa | smith | N/G | | | | |
| Mrs. | Kelly | Smith | N/G | | | | |
| Mr. | Tim | Smith | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Josh | Smith | I'm afraid the development of the land will decrease property values in the Downing Creek and Meadowmont area close to where I work and live. | Comment Noted | | | |
| N/G | Christine | Smith | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Mrs. | Barbara | Smith | The Light rail project will | GoTriangle forecasts an average of | Many communities across the | | |
| | | | | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by | country are implementing or | | |
| | | | benefit a few. We already | the year 2035. For more | extending light rail transit | | |
| | | | have very good bus | information about ridership please | systems because of the long term | | |
| | | | service for people who | see DEIS Section 3.1: Public | value and opportunities which | | |
| | | | desire to use mass transit. | Transportation and DEIS Appendix | they bring to businesses, home | | |
| | | | | K2: Travel Demand Methodology | owners, and people of all | | |
| | | | | and Results Report. As noted in the | generations living, working, | | |
| | | | | Executive Summary (ES-5), the | learning, and traveling along light | | |
| | | | | region's existing transit network is | rail corridors. Studies of light rail | | |
| | | | | currently operating at close to | projects around the country have | | |
| | | | | maximum capacity including 84 | shown a positive impact on | | |
| | | | | buses per hour servicing UNC | properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of | | |
| | | | | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour | a station, cloeset to the improved | | |
| | | | | servicing Duke University and | transportation service. | | |
| | | | | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 | | |
| | | | | Medical Centers. As further detailed | studies around the country, | | |
| | | | | in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, | residential property value | | |
| | | | | this combination of bus routes that | premiums of 3%-40% were | | |
| | | | | currently serve the D-O Corridor | observed in rail station areas. In | | |
| | | | | and provide a high level of transit | Charlotte, a study of single-family | | |
| | | | | service (Figure 1.5-2). However, | home prices indicated increased | | |
| | | | | there are portions of the corridor | value of properties close to light | | |
| | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | rail stations relative to properties | | |
| | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | farther from stations after | | |
| | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | opening of the LYNX Blue Line | | |
| | | | | additional buses will not improve | light rail. | | |
| | | | | service, as discussed further in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2. | | | |
| | | | | In order to maintain the high quality | | | |
| | | | | of life and attract new residents and | | | |
| N/G | Scott | Smith | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Thomas | Smith | N/G | | | | |
| | | Smith | N/G | | | | |
| | Alan | Snavely | N/G | | | | |
| | Anna | Snavely | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Allison | Snyder | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Ms | Susan | Sonberg | I am concerned with the | Planning for high-capacity transit in | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce | There will be 12 trains per hour | GoTriangle forecasts an average of |
| | | | safety of the rail project, | the Triangle region began more | or eliminate pedestrian and | during peak service (six per | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by |
| | | | especially the C2A route | than 20 years ago, and a number of | motorist conflicts with transit | direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and | the year 2035. For more |
| | | | which will place 3 at | studies have been conducted to | vehicles. | 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is | information about ridership |
| | | | grade crossings. This will | advance major transit investments | Detailed information regarding | anticipated to be | please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public |
| | | | exacerbate the significant | in the area, including extensive | the roadways, sidewalks, and | disrupted/blocked due to gate | Transportation and DEIS Appendix |
| | | | traffic congestion that | coordination with stakeholders and | trails expected to be affected by | activation for approximately 30 | K2: Travel Demand Methodology |
| | | | exists at the dangerous | members of the public to develop, | the proposed D-O LRT Project is | seconds per crossing. This | and Results Report. As noted in |
| | | | intersection of Barbee | evaluate, and refine the range of | provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS | includes the time for the | the Executive Summary (ES-5), the |
| | | | Chapel Rd/NC54 and | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | section 3.6, and the Basis for | following stages of the gate | region's existing transit network is |
| | | | obstruct the only points | studies, white papers, and reports | Engineering Design (appendix L). | activation: gates descending, | currently operating at close to |
| | | | residents of Little John Rd | that identified the need for high- | To avoid the potential for | gates fully down ahead of the | maximum capacity including 84 |
| | | | and Downing Creek Pkwy | capacity transit in the region and | incidents at -grade intersections, | arrival of the train, gates fully | buses per hour servicing UNC |
| | | | have to access NC 54. | defined the D-O Corridor are | crossings would be signalized or | down during passage of the train, | Hospitals and 46 buses per hour |
| | | | Trains will run | summarized in Section 2.1. These | equipped with gates with bells to | gates ascending. | servicing Duke University and |
| | | | unsynchronized in each | past studies indicate that the | warn of oncoming trains. The | Traffic would be unobstructed | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) |
| | | | direction every ten | estimated demand for a | trains will also have bells and | during approximately 90% of an | Medical Centers. As further |
| | | | minutes making it nearly | continuously connected rail line to | horns. Bells, gates, and horns | hour during peak hours. During | detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose |
| | | | impossible to get in and | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | would be activated according to | non-peak times (9:00am to | and Need, this combination of bus |
| | | | out of our neighborhood | cost effective for the Project. | Triangle Transit operating | 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), | routes that currently serve the D- |
| | | | without risking our lives | RTP has a significant number of | procedures and safety guidelines, | there will be six trains per hour | O Corridor and provide a high |
| | | | and that of children on | jobs, but they are widely distributed | NCDOT safety guidelines, and | (three per direction). Accordingly, | level of transit service (Figure 1.5- |
| | | | school buses or bikes. | and dispersed compared to Chapel | where applicable, FRA safety | traffic would be unobstructed | 2). However, there are portions of |
| | | | The methodology and | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | guidelines. | during approximately 95% of an | the corridor within Chapel Hill and |
| | | | logic used to establish | development pattern is not as | | hour during non-peak times. | between Duke and downtown |
| | | | ridership estimates that | conducive to rail. | | | Durham where, due to |
| | | | favored C2A are flawed. | The Wake County Transit Plan is | | | congestion, adding additional |
| | | | They are based on a | currently evaluating future potential | | | buses will not improve service, as |
| | | | premise that a slight | transit corridors, which could be | | | discussed further in DEIS section |
| | | | differential in overall time- | studied if a funding source is | | | 3.2. |
| | | | dramatically changes the | secured for transit in Wake County. | | | In order to maintain the high |
| N/G | Shirley | Sopko | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Mrs | Lisa | Spadafino | I believe that a light rail | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and | | | |
| | 2.50 | Spadamio | will not be helpful to us | further explained in DEIS chapter 1, | | | |
| | | | in this region. It will not | the investment benefits of a project | | | |
| | | | be cost effective, very | like the D-O LRT include: improved | | | |
| | | | disruptive while being | mobility, increased connectivity | | | |
| | | | constructed, and not | through expanded transit options, | | | |
| | | | utilized by Durham and | and support of future development | | | |
| | | | Chapel Hill residents. All | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | | |
| | | | in all, it is a waste of tax | provide a competitive, reliable | | | |
| | | | payers money. | alternative to automobile use that | | | |
| | | | Far Far | supports compact development. | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Enhanced mobility will also increase | | | |
| | | | | transit operating efficiency: offer a | | | |
| | | | | competitive, reliable transportation | | | |
| | | | | solution that will reduce travel time. | | | |
| | | | | Increased connectivity will expand | | | |
| | | | | transit options between Durham | | | |
| | | | | and Chapel Hill by enhancing and | | | |
| | | | | seamlessly connecting with the | | | |
| | | | | existing transit system. | | | |
| | | | | , | | | |
| | | | | In addition, increased connectivity | | | |
| | | | | will serve major activity and | | | |
| | | | | employment centers between | | | |
| | | | | Durham and Chapel Hill: the | | | |
| | | | | University of North Carolina at | | | |
| | | | | Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, | | | |
| | | | | US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West | | | |
| | | | | Campus, Duke and Durham | | | |
| | | | | Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| /0 | | 0 " | and the state of | | | | |
| N/G | Linda | Spallone | | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | | | |
| | | | oppose construction, it | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | | | |
| | | | | Project on the existing roadway | | | |
| | | | | network and any measures | | | |
| | | | | recommended to mitigate such | | | |
| | | | lost support of wake co | impacts. Technical reports that | | | |
| | | | participation and | report the results of traffic | | | |
| | | | emphasizing a route | simulations are included as | | | |
| | | | between hospitals does | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | | | |
| | | | not seem the best way to | DEIS. | | | |
| | | | control traffic. They need | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | | | |
| | | | to step back ,regroup and | proposed mitigation measures that | | | |
| | | | solicit is comments and | are planned to mitigate for project- | | | |
| | | | input from all | related roadway effects. These | | | |
| | | | stakeholders, the seem to | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | | | |
| | | | be bouncing from one | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | | | |
| | | | alternative to another | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | | | |
| | | | when ever they meet any | roadway project planned by the | | | |
| | | | kind of opposition I am | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | | | |
| | | | also questioning the many | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | | | |
| | | | at level crossings which | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | | | |
| | | | further impede traffic | continue to coordinate with the | | | |
| | | | flow | NCDOT as the designs of these | | | |
| | | | | projects advance. | | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | | | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|--|------------|------------|
| N/G | linda | spallone | Chapel Hill will be so angry with you, Go Traiangle when they see you destroyed a majot wetland area and you created all this at grade crossings. The future will have no clean water to drink and they will tear out your at grade crossing and say how dumb was that Shame on you | The selected alignment alternatives for the crossings of Little Creek and New Hope Creek were chosen in part because of their limited fragmentation and wildlife impacts. At the crossing of Little Creek, the NEPA Preferred C2A alternative follows along the existing NC 54 for much of its length, minimizing additional habitat fragmentation. The C2A alignment only turns north along George King Road, away from NC 54, in an area of upland forest, and avoids the highest quality bottomland forest habitat of the Little Creek corridor. Similarly, the NEPA Preferred NHC 2 alternative avoids cutting through the intact inner portions of the New Hope Creek bottomland forest by following along the existing US 15-501 through the most sensitive portions of the New Hope Creek bottomlands. In addition to minimizing forest fragmentation by following along existing roadways, both the Little Creek and New Hope Creek crossings will feature raised rail sections supported by bridge piers. This will allow for terrestrial wildlife | Water resources are discussed in DEIS section 4.8. DEIS section 4.8.3.1 summarizes the potential impacts the NEPA Preferred Alternative (which includes the Farrington ROMF). Indirect Effects to Water Resources are described in DEIS Section4.17. As stated on page 4-292, existing federal and state regulations (as described previously) would protect water resources from future indirect or development related impacts. These regulations include Section 404, with its avoidance, minimization, and mitigation hierarchy, FEMA regulations, Section 401 and the Jordan Lake buffer rules, as well as state approvals of sediment and erosion control plans. | | |
| Mr | Gary | Spitz | Very much OPPOSED to this initiative across from our Culp Arbor community. | Comment Noted | | | |
| N/G | Julia | spring | N/G | | | | |
| | Bill | Stagg | N/G | | | | |
| | Elisabeth | Stagg | N/G | | | | |
| | Ilene | Stewart | N/G | | | | |
| | Catherine | Stewart | N/G | | | | |
| 1413 | Catherine | Stewart | 114/5 | | L | <u>I</u> | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|--------------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|
| Dr. | Jim | Stikeleather | is easily assessable by car without getting impacting I40 traffic. | The Wake County Transit Plan is currently evaluating future potential transit corridors, which could be studied if a funding source is secured for transit in Wake County. The Wake County Transit Plan is currently under development. For more information, please see WakeTransit.com | | | |
| | Amanda | Strawbridge | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | George | Stuart | N/G | | | | |
| mr | Gregory | Sulin | for light rail please put it where it was meant to go. | The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas including the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|---|------------|------------|
| Mrs. | Cynthia | Sundy | N/G | | | | |
| Ms. | Kristin | Sundy | N/G | | | | |
| Ms. | Anna | Sundy | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Thomas | Swasey | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Judith | Swasey | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | | Swasey | Light rail as planned ignores the needs of the neighborhoods and there are better, less expensive alternatives like electric buses and protected bike lanes | Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (CRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | Triangle Transit has a robust public outreach approach for the D-O LRT Project, the details of which are included in Chapter 9. | | |
| N/G | Dorothy | Sylvestre | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|--|---|------------|------------|
| | Cindy Lee | Talisman | There is no need to burden the tax payers with a system that will not encompass the entire triangle nor have any federal help. Yes the area is growing BUT this area also like their cars and this will be an needless expenditure for maybe a chosen few. We are NOT NYC or DC that enjoy the rail system and no matter how hard transplants come here and try to | GoTriangle forecasts an average of 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding | As stated in DEIS section 7.1, when the proposed D-O LRT Project is fully advanced through the New Starts process, it is anticipated that the New Starts program will provide approximately 50 percent of the D-O LRT Project's capital cost. The non-New Starts costs will be covered by a combination of funding sources, including sales tax revenue generated in Durham and Orange counties, funding from North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT), and other local fees | Response 3 | Response 4 |
| Mrs | Iwona | Tauer | N/G | where, due to congestion, adding additional buses will not improve service, as discussed further in DEIS section 3.2. In order to maintain the high quality of life and attract new residents and | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|------------------|--|---|---|------------|------------|
| | Ronald | Tell | The grade crossings at Barbie Chapel Road and Downing Creek Parkway will be unsafe for the volume of traffic using both street. You must find a better solution. | eliminate pedestrian and motorist conflicts with transit vehicles. Detailed information regarding the roadways, sidewalks, and trails expected to be affected by the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for Engineering Design (appendix L). To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The trains will also have bells and horns. Bells, gates, and horns would be activated according to Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines. | currently has very limited usage with less than 10 vehicles per hour performing this maneuver in both the AM and PM peak | | |
| Mrs. | W George | Tell Thomason | N/G N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|--------------------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|
| Ms | Alexis | Thompson | Please run the light rail throught the intended development of Meadowmont that was built and approved as a light rail development. | The Town of Chapel Hill requested that alternatives to the C1 alignments be studied as part of the Alternatives Analysis for the Project. As a result, the Project team developed the C2 alignments as part of the Alternatives Analysis. In February 2012, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO) adopted the proposed D-O LRT Project, including both the C1 and C2 alignment corridors. The Town of Chapel Hill expressed its preference for an alignment running south of NC 54 (C2, C2A Alternatives) that would be more supportive of planned future growth than C1 and C1A Alternatives. These alternatives would result in a conversion of less dense land uses into higher density uses near stations. These impacts are considered beneficial and consistent with local planning. The C1 Alternative would impact undisturbed natural areas including the Little Creek Bottomlands and Slopes Significant Natural Heritage | | | |
| Mr | PAUL | THOMPSON | We do not need this expensive boondoggle! | Comment Noted | | | |
| N/G | | Thurman | N/G | | | | |
| | Taylor | Thurman | N/G | | - | | |
| | Anne | Tice | N/G | | | | |
| | Margie | Tippett | N/G | | | | |
| Ms | Elaine | Tomberlin Lopez | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Ingrid | Toth | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Ms | Sally | Trauco | ''' | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | | | |
| | | | not the location along | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | | | |
| | | | Stancil where traffic is | Project on the existing roadway | | | |
| | | | already horrendous! | network and any measures | | | |
| | | | | recommended to mitigate such | | | |
| | | | | impacts. Technical reports that | | | |
| | | | | report the results of traffic | | | |
| | | | | simulations are included as | | | |
| | | | | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | | | |
| | | | | DEIS. | | | |
| | | | | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | | | |
| | | | | proposed mitigation measures that | | | |
| | | | | are planned to mitigate for project- | | | |
| | | | | related roadway effects. These | | | |
| | | | | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | | | |
| | | | | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | | | |
| | | | | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | | | |
| | | | | roadway project planned by the | | | |
| | | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | | | |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | | | |
| | | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | | | |
| | | | | continue to coordinate with the | | | |
| | | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | | | |
| | | | | projects advance. | | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | | | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | | | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | | | |
| Dr. | Dimitri | Trembath | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Dr | Dina | Trobbiani | At grade rail line crossing | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 | | |
| | | | will seriously disrupt | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | and 8.2.2.1, construction of the | | |
| | | | traffic flow and increase | Project on the existing roadway | ROMF at the Farrington Road site | | |
| | | | congestion along | network and any measures | will require land use entitlements | | |
| | | | · · | recommended to mitigate such | including a comprehensive plan | | |
| | | | throttling commute | impacts. Technical reports that | amendment and rezoning. | | |
| | | | to/from | report the results of traffic | It is expected that the City and/or | | |
| | | | 54/40/UNC/Raleigh; | simulations are included as | County of Durham will place | | |
| | | | planned industrial zoned | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | conditions on the approvals that | | |
| | | | ROMF site will do same | DEIS. | appropriate mitigation measures | | |
| | | | and devalue properties in | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | are included in the design, | | |
| | | | | proposed mitigation measures that | including strategies to | | |
| | | | communities. | are planned to mitigate for project- | complement the surrounding | | |
| | | | | related roadway effects. These | context such as use of | | |
| | | | | effects are summarized in Table 3.2- | architectural styles and/or | | |
| | | | | 3. In addition, as described in DEIS | landscape design. | | |
| | | | | section 3.2.2, there are numerous | During Engineering, Triangle | | |
| | | | | roadway project planned by the | Transit will continue to | | |
| | | | | NCDOT in the vicinity of the | coordinate with property owners | | |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During | and residents near the site to | | |
| | | | | Engineering, Triangle Transit will | develop and refine these | | |
| | | | | continue to coordinate with the | strategies. The public will also | | |
| | | | | NCDOT as the designs of these | have the opportunity to | | |
| | | | | projects advance. | comment on the design through | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | a public hearing as part of the | | |
| | | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | City and/or County approval | | |
| | | | | substantial modifications to the | process. | | |
| | | | | roadway are incorporated into the | As described in DEIS section | | |
| | | | | design including additional turn | 4.10.4, no noise impacts are | | |
| | | | | bays and restriping of intersection | anticipated at the Farrington | | |
| | | | | approaches to accommodate | ROMF. Section 4.4.3.1 states | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Gil | Turner | The bottom line in all of | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and | | | |
| 14/0 | Gii | Turner | this tax waste is that | further explained in DEIS chapter 1, | | | |
| | | | Chapel Hill and Durham | the investment benefits of a project | | | |
| | | | will STILL NOT HAVE | like the D-O LRT include: improved | | | |
| | | | ADEQUATE | mobility, increased connectivity | | | |
| | | | TRANSPORTATION and | through expanded transit options, | | | |
| | | | their residents will be | and support of future development | | | |
| | | | burdened with excessive | plans. Enhanced mobility will | | | |
| | | | tax and NO BENEFITS. | provide a competitive, reliable | | | |
| | | | tax and NO BENEFITS. | alternative to automobile use that | | | |
| | | | | supports compact development. | | | |
| | | | | supports compact development. | | | |
| | | | | Enhanced mobility will also increase | | | |
| | | | | transit operating efficiency: offer a | | | |
| | | | | competitive, reliable transportation | | | |
| | | | | solution that will reduce travel time. | | | |
| | | | | Increased connectivity will expand | | | |
| | | | | transit options between Durham | | | |
| | | | | and Chapel Hill by enhancing and | | | |
| | | | | seamlessly connecting with the | | | |
| | | | | existing transit system. | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | In addition, increased connectivity | | | |
| | | | | will serve major activity and | | | |
| | | | | employment centers between | | | |
| | | | | Durham and Chapel Hill: the | | | |
| | | | | University of North Carolina at | | | |
| | | | | Chapel Hill (UNC), east Chapel Hill, | | | |
| | | | | US 15-501 Corridor, Duke West | | | |
| | | | | Campus, Duke and Durham | | | |
| | | | | Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|---|---|------------|
| ms | Barbara | Ulam Ulam | I am against the proposed light rail system that will pass by the entrance to Downing Creek in Chapel Hill. It will effect property | There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During nonpeak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times. | Many communities across the country are implementing or extending light rail transit systems because of the long term value and opportunities which they bring to businesses, home owners, and people of all generations living, working, learning, and traveling along light rail corridors. Studies of light rail projects around the country have shown a positive impact on properties within 1/4 to 1 mile of a station, cloeset to the improved transportation service. Nationwide, in a synthesis of 12 studies around the country, residential property value premiums of 3%-40% were observed in rail station areas. In Charlotte, a study of single-family home prices indicated increased value of properties close to light rail stations relative to properties farther from stations after | DEIS section 4.10.4 and table 4.10-6 provides a summary of the noise and vibration impacts for the alternatives. For the proposed D-O LRT Project, it is anticipated that severe noise impacts would occur at one location and moderate noise impacts would occur at four locations with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Vibration impacts would occur at 8 receptors and ground-borne noise impacts would occur at 13 receptors with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Other alternative alignments would result in some additional impacts at receptors, but the number of additional impact locations is not | Response 4 |
| Dr | Jan | Ulrich | N/G | | | | |
| Dr | Beth | Ulrich | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/C | Gaby | Valdivia | The light rail to connect | URS/AECOM, a company consulting | GoTriangle forecasts an average | | |
| IN/ G | Gaby | Valuivia | chapel hill and Durham is | with Triangle Transit, prepared the | of 23,000 weekday light rail trips | | |
| | | | a wasteful project with | technical information and | by the year 2035. For more | | |
| | | | little ridership impact. | | information about ridership | | |
| | | | There's not sufficient | environmental impact analysis for the Project on behalf of the Federal | please see DEIS Section 3.1: | | |
| | | | | Transit Administration as well as | Public Transportation and DEIS | | |
| | | | - | GoTriangle. The DEIS was prepared | Appendix K2: Travel Demand | | |
| | | | | in accordance with the National | Methodology and Results Report. | | |
| | | | burden on residents, it | | As noted in the Executive | | |
| | | | , | Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as | | | |
| | | | | well as Moving Ahead for Progress | Summary (ES-5), the region's | | |
| | | | | in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21); | existing transit network is | | |
| | | | based on dubious and | Environmental Impact and Related | currently operating at close to | | |
| | | | poor research. Stop. | Procedures of 1987 [23 Code of | maximum capacity including 84 | | |
| | | | | Federal Regulations (CFR) § 771]; | buses per hour servicing UNC | | |
| | | | | Section 4(f) of the US Department of | | | |
| | | | | Transportation (USDOT) Act of 1966 | | | |
| | | | | [49 U.S.C. § 303] and [23 CFR § | Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) | | |
| | | | | 774]; and Section 404 of the Clean | Medical Centers. As further | | |
| | | | | Water Act of 1977 [33 U.S.C. § | detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose | | |
| | | | | 1251], among others. A legal | and Need, this combination of | | |
| | | | | sufficiency review of the DEIS was | bus routes that currently serve | | |
| | | | | also conducted by the FTA and | the D-O Corridor and provide a | | |
| | | | | Triangle Transit. | high level of transit service | | |
| | | | | | (Figure 1.5-2). However, there | | |
| | | | | | are portions of the corridor | | |
| | | | | | within Chapel Hill and between | | |
| | | | | | Duke and downtown Durham | | |
| | | | | | where, due to congestion, adding | | |
| | | | | | additional buses will not improve | | |
| | | | | | service, as discussed further in | | |
| | | | | | DEIS section 3.2. | | |
| N/G | Stef | van Dijk | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Connie | Vance | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Andrea | Vinson | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|--|---|---|------------|------------|
| Ms | Delores | Vitali | This Rail system is going to hinder the traffic that already exists. How and how many people are going to ride it?? Certainly not the elderly and crippled. What is going to happen on Farrington Road is a total disgrace. What are you people thinking of , besides putting money in your pockets! | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate | There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an hour during peak hours. During non-peak times (9:00am to 3:30pm and 7:00pm to midnight), there will be six trains per hour (three per direction). Accordingly, traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 95% of an hour during non-peak times. | | |
| Ms. | Ann | Von Holle | The light rail will be a danger and nuisance to Downing Creek, the community in which I live. | Comment Noted | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Mrs. | Jane | Wagstaff | that will never ever attract the projected ridership. | As stated in Triangle Transit's Request to Enter the New Starts Program Project Development Phase for the proposed Durham- Orange Light Rail Transit Project: "Within the D-O Corridor, transit use already rivals larger municipalities. For example, when Chapel Hill Transit, Durham Area Transit Authority, Duke University Transit, and Triangle Transit riders are counted together, approximately 70,000 transit trips occur every weekday within and between Chapel Hill and Durham. This level of ridership is comparable to the roughly 73,000 daily transit trips taken in Charlotte in 2006, the year before the LYNX Blue Line Light Rail Transit Line opened." Since Charlotte opened the Blue Line in 2007, Charlotte has continued to expand its rail transit system. In 2015 it opened the Gold Line (streetcar) and is currently in the process of constructing Blue Line Extension (LRT). | | | |
| N/G | Shelley | Walter | N/G | | | | |
| | | Ward | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Robert | Ward | N/G | | | | |
| | | Warren | N/G | | | | |
| | | Warren | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|---|---|------------|------------|
| Mrs. | Julie | Warshaw | The poor planning and total lack of response in regard to the local stations and routing for the light rail system is an unfortunate indicator of the problems this system will cause as a whole. | Comment Noted | | | |
| Mrs | Suzanne | Waters | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Robert | Weaver | Low riders to warrant expense. | 23,000 weekday light rail trips by the year 2035. For more information about ridership please see DEIS Section 3.1: Public Transportation and DEIS Appendix K2: Travel Demand Methodology and Results Report. As noted in the Executive Summary (ES-5), the region's existing transit network is currently operating at close to maximum capacity including 84 buses per hour servicing UNC Hospitals and 46 buses per hour servicing Duke University and Durham Veterans Affairs (VA) Medical Centers. As further detailed in 1.5.1.2 of the Purpose and Need, this combination of bus routes that currently serve the D-O Corridor and provide a high level of transit service (Figure 1.5-2). However, there are portions of the corridor within Chapel Hill and between Duke and downtown Durham where, due to congestion, adding | plans. Enhanced mobility will provide a competitive, reliable alternative to automobile use that supports compact development. Enhanced mobility will also increase transit operating efficiency: offer a competitive, reliable transportation solution that will reduce travel time. Increased connectivity will expand transit options between Durham and Chapel Hill by enhancing and seamlessly connecting with the existing transit system. In addition, increased connectivity will serve major activity and employment centers between Durham and Chapel Hill: | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|---------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Catharina | Weaver | To get a rail system to | Planning for high-capacity transit in | | | |
| | | | function it needs to cover | the Triangle region began more | | | |
| | | | all of Triangle. | than 20 years ago, and a number of | | | |
| | | | The area most benefiting | studies have been conducted to | | | |
| | | | from a light rail would be | advance major transit investments | | | |
| | | | Research Triangle Park | in the area, including extensive | | | |
| | | | and the Raleigh-Durham | coordination with stakeholders and | | | |
| | | | Airport | members of the public to develop, | | | |
| | | | | evaluate, and refine the range of | | | |
| | | | | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | | | |
| | | | | studies, white papers, and reports | | | |
| | | | | that identified the need for high- | | | |
| | | | | capacity transit in the region and | | | |
| | | | | defined the D-O Corridor are | | | |
| | | | | summarized in Section 2.1. These | | | |
| | | | | past studies indicate that the | | | |
| | | | | estimated demand for a | | | |
| | | | | continuously connected rail line to | | | |
| | | | | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | | | |
| | | | | cost effective for the Project. | | | |
| | | | | RTP has a significant number of | | | |
| | | | | jobs, but they are widely distributed | | | |
| | | | | and dispersed compared to Chapel | | | |
| | | | | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | | | |
| | | | | development pattern is not as | | | |
| | | | | conducive to rail. | | | |
| | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | | | |
| | | | | currently evaluating future potential | | | |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be | | | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is | | | |
| | | | | secured for transit in Wake County. | | | |
| Mrs | Mary | Webb | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Michael | Webb | Please reject | Comment Noted | | | |
| _ | Aaron | Webel | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | | Weed-Buzinski | N/G | | | | |
| Ms. | Janice | Welsh | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|--|------------|------------|
| N/G | Rose | Wenzel | We, the public, have not received the necessary objective information to make an informed decision on this Durham-Orange Light Rail project | Triangle Transit has a robust public outreach approach for the D-O LRT Project, the details of which are included in Chapter 9. | | | |
| N/G | Stephen | Whilden | I like the idea of a light rail reducing congestion on HWY 54, but it needs to be on the OTHER side of the highway where there is NO development. Low- emission buses would be a good substitute to the current plan. | Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (CRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | The location of the proposed Woodmont Station is located on the south side of NC 54 to support a significant portion of the Town of Chapel Hill's Future Focus area for growth along NC 54. Running the alignment along the north side of NC 54 and subsequently the placement of the Woodmont Station would not be supportive of the Town of Chapel Hill's growth policies. | | |
| Mrs. | Courtney | Whilden | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| N/G | Julia | Whitaker | I am in favor of | Various transit technologies were | The Triangle region has | | |
| , - | | | transportation | previously studied and evaluated in | experienced extraordinary | | |
| | | | improvement. But the | an extensive public process called | growth in recent years. Growth | | |
| | | | • | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | forecasts show population in the | | |
| | | | saves and is likely to be | Technologies considered during the | region increasing by 80 percent | | |
| | | | • | AA included: conventional bus, Bus | between 2010 and 2040, from | | |
| | | | • | Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light | 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O | | |
| | | | environmental and | Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter | Corridor, the population is | | |
| | | | residential negative | Rail Transit (CRT). Through the | projected to double and the | | |
| | | | | Alternatives Analysis, light rail was | highest expected travel intensity | | |
| | | | us a more fiscally | selected as the best transit | (number of trips per acre) in the | | |
| | | | responsible option. | technology option to best serve the | | | |
| | | | | Durham-Orange Corridor and to | located in this corridor. | | |
| | | | | meet the Purpose and Need of the | | | |
| | | | | proposed transit project. The | Even under current demands, the | | |
| | | | | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | region's transportation system is | | |
| | | | | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | | | |
| | | | | The Alternatives Analysis is available | | | |
| | | | | on ourtransitfuture.com. | anticipated to worsen, which will | | |
| | | | | | lead to increased travel times | | |
| | | | | | and the continuation of | | |
| | | | | | automobile-oriented | | |
| | | | | | development patterns. The | | |
| | | | | | region's explosive growth is also | | |
| | | | | | outpacing the ability to repair, | | |
| | | | | | replace and expand the existing | | |
| | | | | | roadway network. Considering | | |
| | | | | | financial and environmental | | |
| | | | | | issues, simply increasing highway | | |
| | | | | | capacity to meet these demands | | |
| | | | | | is no longer a viable option (ES- | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|---|---|--|--|
| N/G | Kenneth | White | I am strongly opposed to going forward with the proposed DO Light Rail Project. The project has the potential to create | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the impact of the proposed D-O LRT Project on the existing roadway network and any measures recommended to mitigate such | motorist conflicts with transit | In general, light rail transit is a very safe mode of transportation. Per FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics Report available on the site referenced above, crash rates | Project is fully advanced through the New Starts process, it is |
| | | | noise and safety hazard in established residential | impacts. Technical reports that report the results of traffic simulations are included as Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the DEIS. DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | the proposed D-O LRT Project is provided in DEIS section 3.2, DEIS section 3.6, and the Basis for | for rail transit in the US ranged from 2.16 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents per 100 million Passenger Miles for the six-year study period in that report. For | program will provide approximately 50 percent of the D-O LRT Project's capital cost. The non-New Starts costs will be covered by a combination of funding sources, including sales |
| | | | huge tax burden on the citizens of these communities. | proposed mitigation measures that are planned to mitigate for project-related roadway effects. These effects are summarized in Table 3.2-3. In addition, as described in DEIS section 3.2.2, there are numerous roadway project planned by the NCDOT in the vicinity of the | To avoid the potential for incidents at -grade intersections, crossings would be signalized or equipped with gates with bells to warn of oncoming trains. The | comparison, statistics on motor vehicle crash rates are available from NCDOT at the following link: | tax revenue generated in Durham and Orange counties, funding from North Carolina Department |
| | | | | proposed D-O LRT Project. During Engineering, Triangle Transit will continue to coordinate with the NCDOT as the designs of these projects advance. As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 and as shown in Table 3.2-5, substantial modifications to the roadway are incorporated into the design including additional turn | Triangle Transit operating procedures and safety guidelines, NCDOT safety guidelines, and where applicable, FRA safety guidelines. | | credit assistance and possible alternative financing and value capture options. |
| mr | landon | whitt | N/G | bays and restriping of intersection approaches to accommodate | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| N/G | Marc | Wiesenberg | The choice of the | In general, light rail transit is a very | Triangle Transit seeks to reduce | DEIS section 3.2 discusses the | |
| 11,0 | iviar c | Vicacinacia | "preferred" Light Rail | safe mode of transportation. Per | _ | impact of the proposed D-O LRT | |
| | | | _ · | FTA's 2009 Rail Safety Statistics | • | Project on the existing roadway | |
| | | | with the NC 54 corridor | Report available on the site | vehicles. | network and any measures | |
| | | | | referenced above, crash rates for | Detailed information regarding | recommended to mitigate such | |
| | | | , , | rail transit in the US ranged from | | impacts. Technical reports that | |
| | | | · | 2.16 accidents per 100 million | • • • | report the results of traffic | |
| | | | actually benefit from an | Passenger Miles to 5.35 accidents | the proposed D-O LRT Project is | simulations are included as | |
| | | | LRT line. | per 100 million Passenger Miles for | | Appendix K.4 through K.11 of the | |
| | | | Documented concerns | the six-year study period in that | section 3.6, and the Basis for | DEIS. | |
| | | | regarding citizen serious | report. For comparison, statistics on | I | DEIS section 3.2.4 describes the | |
| | | | safety and exacerbated | motor vehicle crash rates are | | proposed mitigation measures | |
| | | | | available from NCDOT at the | | that are planned to mitigate for | |
| | | | issues, to name just two, | following link: | - · | project-related roadway effects. | |
| | | | have either been | https://connect.ncdot.gov/resource | o o | l | |
| | | | | s/safety/pages/crash-data.aspx. | warn of oncoming trains. The | Table 3.2-3. In addition, as | |
| | | | ignored. Aside from | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | _ | described in DEIS section 3.2.2, | |
| | | | these matters, the cost of | | horns. Bells, gates, and horns | there are numerous roadway | |
| | | | this proposal, including an | | would be activated according to | project planned by the NCDOT in | |
| | | | expectation of significant | | _ | the vicinity of the proposed D-O | |
| | | | Federal assistance, makes | | procedures and safety guidelines, | | |
| | | | this project ill-advised. | | NCDOT safety guidelines, and | Triangle Transit will continue to | |
| | | | Tax revenue would be far | | where applicable, FRA safety | coordinate with the NCDOT as | |
| | | | better utilized by funding | | guidelines. | the designs of these projects | |
| | | | current NC DOT plans to | | | advance. | |
| | | | streamline Highway 54 | | | As described in DEIS section 3.2.4 | |
| | | | between 15/501 and I-40. | | | and as shown in Table 3.2-5, | |
| | | | The implementation of | | | substantial modifications to the | |
| | | | these improvements | | | roadway are incorporated into | |
| | | | would make a huge | | | the design including additional | |
| | | | difference toward | | | turn bays and restriping of | |
| Mrs. | Joni | Williams | N/G | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Robert - · | Williams | N/G | | | | |
| | Travis | Williams | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Carrie | Williams | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|--|--|---|---|
| | Jonathan | Williams | PLEASE, PLEASE do not proceed with Orange County- Durham County light rail project. (1) In my opinion this is not an acceptable use for tax payer dollars. (2) Personally, I hate to think of the disruption this will cause to my Downing Creek neighborhood. (3) IF there should be any light rail in the Triangle, and that is highly debatable, its primary goal should be to alleviate congestion on I-40. Orange County Durham County light rail plan does not. | In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services. | As described in DEIS section 8.1 and further explained in DEIS chapter 1, the investment | Enhancements to bus service are part of the Durham County and Orange County Bus and Rail Investment Plans (BRIPs). Both BRIPs were developed and approved by county commissioners before the successful sales tax referenda in 2011 and 2012, and both have guided the provision of new bus service in the two counties over the past few years. For more information about provisions for improved bus service under the BRIPs, please see http://ourtransitfuture.com/durh am-county-bus-and-rail-investment-plan/. As noted in DEIS Table 5.3-1, the revenue from the half-cent sales tax in Durham County for public transportation is being used to fund project development for the proposed D-O LRT Project and to implement improvements to DATA bus services. In addition, the sales tax will be used to support the design and | There will be 12 trains per hour during peak service (six per direction, 5:30 to 9:00am and 3:30 to 7:00 pm). Traffic is anticipated to be disrupted/blocked due to gate activation for approximately 30 seconds per crossing. This includes the time for the following stages of the gate activation: gates descending, gates fully down ahead of the arrival of the train, gates fully down during passage of the train, gates ascending. Traffic would be unobstructed during approximately 90% of an |
| Mrs. | Anne D. | Williams | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Mrs | Elizabeth | Williams | I think the cost to use | Various transit technologies were | The Triangle region has | | |
| | | | ratio is to high. Fix roads | previously studied and evaluated in | experienced extraordinary | | |
| | | | and bus lines. | an extensive public process called | growth in recent years. Growth | | |
| | | | | the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). | forecasts show population in the | | |
| | | | | Technologies considered during the | region increasing by 80 percent | | |
| | | | | AA included: conventional bus, Bus | between 2010 and 2040, from | | |
| | | | | Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light | 1.6 to 2.9 million. Within the D-O | | |
| | | | | Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter | Corridor, the population is | | |
| | | | | Rail Transit (CRT). Through the | projected to double and the | | |
| | | | | Alternatives Analysis, light rail was | highest expected travel intensity | | |
| | | | | selected as the best transit | (number of trips per acre) in the | | |
| | | | | technology option to best serve the | Triangle region is predominately | | |
| | | | | Durham-Orange Corridor and to | located in this corridor. | | |
| | | | | meet the Purpose and Need of the | | | |
| | | | | proposed transit project. The | Even under current demands, the | | |
| | | | | findings of the Alternatives Analysis | region's transportation system is | | |
| | | | | are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. | beginning to strain. Levels of | | |
| | | | | The Alternatives Analysis is available | congestion are increasing and are | | |
| | | | | on ourtransitfuture.com. | anticipated to worsen, which will | | |
| | | | | | lead to increased travel times | | |
| | | | | | and the continuation of | | |
| | | | | | automobile-oriented | | |
| | | | | | development patterns. The | | |
| | | | | | region's explosive growth is also | | |
| | | | | | outpacing the ability to repair, | | |
| | | | | | replace and expand the existing | | |
| | | | | | roadway network. Considering | | |
| | | | | | financial and environmental | | |
| | | | | | issues, simply increasing highway | | |
| | | | | | capacity to meet these demands | | |
| | | | | | is no longer a viable option (ES- | | |
| ms | dottie | williford | stop the rail it ruins | Comment Noted | | | |
| | | | peoples homes | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------------|------------------|-----------|--|--|--|------------|------------|
| Title Ms | PirstName Diane | Willis | This light rail project is worthless without going to RTP and the airport. The cost is way too high and the disruptions to neighborhoods are far too great. Let's do bus rapid | Planning for high-capacity transit in the Triangle region began more than 20 years ago, and a number of studies have been conducted to advance major transit investments in the area, including extensive coordination with stakeholders and members of the public to develop, evaluate, and refine the range of alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key studies, white papers, and reports that identified the need for high-capacity transit in the region and defined the D-O Corridor are summarized in Section 2.1. These past studies indicate that the estimated demand for a continuously connected rail line to RDU and RTP is not warranted or cost effective for the Project. RTP has a significant number of jobs, but they are widely distributed and dispersed compared to Chapel | Various transit technologies were previously studied and evaluated in an extensive public process called the "Alternatives Analysis" (AA). Technologies considered during the AA included: conventional bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Streetcar, Light Rail Transit (LRT), and Commuter Rail Transit (CRT). Through the Alternatives Analysis, light rail was selected as the best transit technology option to best serve the Durham-Orange Corridor and to meet the Purpose and Need of the proposed transit project. The findings of the Alternatives Analysis are summarized in 2.2.1 of the DEIS. The Alternatives Analysis is available on ourtransitfuture.com. | | Response 4 |
| Mr | Erik | Wilson | We don't need this. We need to get out of debt | | | | |
| N/G | Alison | Windram | NO LITE RAIL. DONT WASTE MY MONEY!! | Comment Noted | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Ms. | Leslie | Wiseman | Does not go to the airport | Planning for high-capacity transit in | | | |
| | 2000 | Tribea | so not a fan. | the Triangle region began more | | | |
| | | | | than 20 years ago, and a number of | | | |
| | | | | studies have been conducted to | | | |
| | | | | advance major transit investments | | | |
| | | | | in the area, including extensive | | | |
| | | | | coordination with stakeholders and | | | |
| | | | | members of the public to develop, | | | |
| | | | | evaluate, and refine the range of | | | |
| | | | | alternatives (Figure 2.1-1). The key | | | |
| | | | | studies, white papers, and reports | | | |
| | | | | that identified the need for high- | | | |
| | | | | capacity transit in the region and | | | |
| | | | | defined the D-O Corridor are | | | |
| | | | | summarized in Section 2.1. These | | | |
| | | | | past studies indicate that the | | | |
| | | | | estimated demand for a | | | |
| | | | | continuously connected rail line to | | | |
| | | | | RDU and RTP is not warranted or | | | |
| | | | | cost effective for the Project. | | | |
| | | | | RTP has a significant number of | | | |
| | | | | jobs, but they are widely distributed | | | |
| | | | | and dispersed compared to Chapel | | | |
| | | | | Hill and Durham. This dispersed | | | |
| | | | | development pattern is not as | | | |
| | | | | conducive to rail. | | | |
| | | | | The Wake County Transit Plan is | | | |
| | | | | currently evaluating future potential | | | |
| | | | | transit corridors, which could be | | | |
| | | | | studied if a funding source is | | | |
| | | | | secured for transit in Wake County. | | | |
| N/G | Robin | Wood | N/G | | | | |
| Mrs | Rhonda | Woodell | N/G | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Ms | Lucy | Woodell | I feel further studies | As stated in DEIS section 4.1.4.1 and | Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents | | |
| | , | | involving traffic, noise and | 8.2.2.1, construction of the ROMF at | · · | | |
| | | | ruining a wonderful | the Farrington Road site will require | | | |
| | | | residential setting is so | land use entitlements including a | NEPA Preferred Alternative was | | |
| | | | unnecessary by putting | comprehensive plan amendment | selected and why the other | | |
| | | | the maintenance facility | and rezoning. | alternatives were eliminated | | |
| | | | on Farrington Road when | It is expected that the City and/or | from consideration. The | | |
| | | | there other places that | County of Durham will place | Farrington Road ROMF | | |
| | | | would be much more | conditions on the approvals that | Alternative is included in the | | |
| | | | suited for this type of | appropriate mitigation measures | NEPA Preferred Alternative. | | |
| | | | structure. I think some of | are included in the design, including | In summary, the Farrington Road | | |
| | | | the information | strategies to complement the | ROMF Alternative site is the most | | |
| | | | presented to the affected | surrounding context such as use of | desirable from a construction | | |
| | | | neighborhoods is not | architectural styles and/or | and operations standpoint. It is a | | |
| | | | accurate and some | landscape design. | 25-acre site, the largest site of | | |
| | | | studies have been | During Engineering, Triangle Transit | the alternatives considered. The | | |
| | | | eliminated altogether it | will continue to coordinate with | Farrington Road ROMF site is | | |
| | | | seems. This is simply not | property owners and residents near | located on a long straight section | | |
| | | | the place for what has | the site to develop and refine these | of track which accommodates | | |
| | | | been proposed. | strategies. The public will also have | cross-overs for access to the | | |
| | | | | the opportunity to comment on the | yard. The site is reasonably flat, | | |
| | | | | design through a public hearing as | making preparation of the site | | |
| | | | | part of the City and/or County | for construction easier. Effective | | |
| | | | | approval process. | screening buffers can be | | |
| | | | | As described in DEIS section 4.10.4, | provided around the site. The | | |
| | | | | no noise impacts are anticipated at | largest land owner on the site | | |
| | | | | the Farrington ROMF. Section | has expressed support for the | | |
| | | | | 4.4.3.1 states lighting would be | Farrington Road ROMF | | |
| | | | | aimed towards the ROMF to reduce | Alternative. The site would have | | |
| | | | | spillage onto neighboring properties | no effects to historic resources. | | |
| | | | | and adjacent roadways. In addition, | The Farrington Road ROMF | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Mr. | Philip | Woodell | The light rail project is not | Section 8.2 of the DEIS presents the | As stated in Triangle Transit's | | |
| | | | needed because I feel | evaluation of ROMF alternatives and | _ | | |
| | | | | explains why the NEPA Preferred | Program Project Development | | |
| | | | · · | Alternative was selected and why | Phase for the proposed Durham- | | |
| | | | been advertised. The | the other alternatives were | Orange Light Rail Transit Project: | | |
| | | | proposed maintenance | eliminated from consideration. The | , | | |
| | | | facility should not be | Farrington Road ROMF Alternative is | "Within the D-O Corridor, transit | | |
| | | | located on Farrington | included in the NEPA Preferred | use already rivals larger | | |
| | | | Road because it will make | Alternative. | municipalities. For example, | | |
| | | | traffic worst than it is | In summary, the Farrington Road | when Chapel Hill Transit, Durham | | |
| | | | already. | ROMF Alternative site is the most | Area Transit Authority, Duke | | |
| | | | | desirable from a construction and | University Transit, and Triangle | | |
| | | | | operations standpoint. It is a 25- | Transit riders are counted | | |
| | | | | acre site, the largest site of the | together, approximately 70,000 | | |
| | | | | alternatives considered. The | transit trips occur every weekday | | |
| | | | | Farrington Road ROMF site is | within and between Chapel Hill | | |
| | | | | located on a long straight section of | and Durham. This level of | | |
| | | | | track which accommodates cross- | ridership is comparable to the | | |
| | | | | overs for access to the yard. The site | roughly 73,000 daily transit trips | | |
| | | | | is reasonably flat, making | taken in Charlotte in 2006, the | | |
| | | | | preparation of the site for | year before the LYNX Blue Line | | |
| | | | | construction easier. Effective | Light Rail Transit Line opened." | | |
| | | | | screening buffers can be provided | | | |
| | | | | around the site. The largest land | Since Charlotte opened the Blue | | |
| | | | | owner on the site has expressed | Line in 2007, Charlotte has | | |
| | | | | support for the Farrington Road | continued to expand its rail | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative. The site would | transit system. In 2015 it opened | | |
| | | | | have no effects to historic | the Gold Line (streetcar) and is | | |
| | | | | resources. The Farrington Road | currently in the process of | | |
| | | | | ROMF Alternative also has the | constructing Blue Line Extension | | |
| | | | | lowest cost of all ROMF alternatives | (LRT). | | |
| N/G | Regina | Wyatt | N/G | | | | |
| N/G | Edward | Wyatt | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Trent | Yancey | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | younger | ye | N/G | | | | |

| Title | FirstName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------|--------------------|--------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| | Younger | Ye | that creates noise, pollution, property degradation, all but a solution to traffic. It must stop! | In general, the project is not expected to have a significant effect on traffic on those roadways where it is close to D-O LRT Project, nor always offer a faster travel time. However, the D-O LRT Project will provide a competitive and reliable travel alternative to the congestion on these roadways, particularly during the peak traffic hours and will provide improved travel time reliability compared to bus transit services. | and maintain the proposed D-O LRT Project, it will be necessary for Triangle Transit to acquire private property. When property is selected to be acquired, all other alternatives will have been considered. That property will have been determined to be the best location for the D-O LRT Project to serve the public. As a result, some citizens may be displaced from their homes or businesses. Local, state, and federal regulations and laws govern the acquisition of private property for public use. These laws ensure that owners of property acquired for public projects are treated fairly and consistently. They are designed to encourage and expedite acquisition by agreements with property owners, to minimize litigation and relieve congestion in the courts, and to promote public confidence in land acquisition | 4.10-6 provides a summary of the noise and vibration impacts for the alternatives. For the proposed D-O LRT Project, it is anticipated that severe noise impacts would occur at one location and moderate noise impacts would occur at four locations with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Vibration impacts would occur at 8 receptors and ground-borne noise impacts would occur at 13 receptors with the NEPA Preferred Alternative. Other alternative alignments would result in some additional impacts at receptors, but the number of additional impact locations is not | Water resources are discussed in DEIS section 4.8. DEIS section 4.8.3.1 summarizes the potential impacts the NEPA Preferred Alternative (which includes the Farrington ROMF). Indirect Effects to Water Resources are described in DEIS Section4.17. As stated on page 4-292, existing federal and state regulations (as described previously) would protect water resources from future indirect or development related impacts. These regulations include Section 404, with its avoidance, minimization, and mitigation hierarchy, FEMA regulations, Section 401 and the Jordan Lake buffer rules, as well as state approvals of sediment and erosion control plans. |
| Mr | Richard | Yenoff | N/G | | | | |
| Dr. | Susan | Yeyeodu | N/G | | | | |
| | Laura | Yost-Grande | N/G | | | | |
| | Lesley | Young | N/G | | | | |
| | Stephen | Young | N/G | | | | |
| • | Jackie | Young | N/G | | | | |
| | Edward | Zapolsky | N/G | | | | |
| | Xiao | Zhang | N/G | | | | |
| Mr | Bingjun | Zheng | N/G | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | C - field not coll | ected by the | | | | | |
| * N/C | G - not given | | | | | | |

| Title First | stName | Last Name | Comment | Response 1 | Response 2 | Response 3 | Response 4 |
|-------------|-------------|----------------|---------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| * S/C/P - S | State, Coun | ty or Province | | | | | |
| * PC - Post | st Code | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |